

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXXIX

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 5, 1939

NUMBER 1283

That End-of-Summer Crisis

The harvest is on in Europe, and as soon as the grain is reaped the time of year will be right, according to orthodox military principles, for Germany to strike. In preparation, the authorities of the Reich are mobilizing both words and men. Hitler at Munich said, "We want no war; our political leadership knows it from experience at the front; but we want our rights. If these rights are denied us, then a nation of 80,000,000 will know how to fight fanatically." Goebbels at Essen taunted the British because "the Japanese strip them naked and they can do nothing." He threatened war if German demands are denied, saying, "We want just and natural living conditions. We want to do away with the wrongs of Versailles. We do not want forever to belong to the have-nots." It is reported that 2,000,000 Germans are now under arms. Hitler will, when the time is ripe, demand Danzig, the Polish Corridor and colonies at least. The military authorities are said to be convinced that the stifled unrest of the people requires another victory of foreign policy, if not war itself.

Chamberlain on his side has been preparing the way for one or the other by his long delays in making a firm alliance with the Soviet Union. Hitler has thus been led to believe that he has only to demand forcefully again in order to induce a surrender, or that in default of that his enemies are so inharmonious and indecisive that he can take what he wants by a short

war. We shall have a crisis; its result still seems likely to be a new Munich.

What Hitler Hopes to Get

While Germany blusters, Italy so far is unusually silent. This may give support to the theory of "Pertinax" in his correspondence to The New York Times, that Hitler is planning to subdue Poland while keeping Britain and France immobilized. The Western Powers, he believes, cannot invade Germany across the Siegfried line, and will not try. Italy would offer a route for a flank attack if she were in the war, therefore the strategy is for her to remain neutral. She might even receive concessions from the "democracies" for her neutrality. Germany, it is said, expects to be able to gain her objectives in Poland within six weeks; she does not look for effective opposition from the Soviet Union. In the meantime air raids to the west and possible land action against Holland and Belgium would have terrorized the Western Powers into surrendering the rich colonies of the two small nations. Franco might create a diversion by attacking French Morocco. This, at least, is the war plan that is foreseen in France. One wonders whether Hitler does not want it to be foreseen and thus to lead to a surrender before a gun is fired. The only possible offset to this strategy is a firm intention on the part of Britain, France and Russia to throw their whole power against the Reich and see through any hostilities he may start. In that case, the chances are that he won't start any.

CONTENTS

The Week 233

Editorials

Recovery by Investment 236
Washington's Third Term 237
Churches in Spain 238

General Articles

Who's Ahead in China? . . . Nathaniel Peffer 239
Inside Franco's Spain
Lawrence A. Fernsworth 241
After the New Deal: IV . . . W. Jett Lauck 243
The Swaggering Gait (verse) . . .
William Carlos Williams 246
Fourth of July Bruce Bliven 247

Jews of No Man's Land (verse) . . Joy Davidman 248

Shoot the Works Heywood Broun 249

Washington Notes T. R. B. 250

Other People's Money John T. Flynn 251

Breathing Spell Otis Ferguson 252

The Bandwagon 253

Correspondence 253

Books in Review

The Man at the Wheel Otis Ferguson 256

The Revolt Against Quietism
Max Lerner 257

Stendhaliana Ramon Guthrie 258

Stein on Picasso Nathalie Swan 259

Prelude to the Present Norbert Guterman 259

New Books: A Reader's List 260

M. Bonnet's Invitation

French Foreign Minister Bonnet on June 25 made a speech in which he demanded that the United States join the peace front which Great Britain and France are building to halt Germany and Italy. He declared that "America holds the key to peace or war" and that if we would align ourselves firmly with the democracies there would be no conflict. M. Bonnet's speech raises several interesting questions. Are Great Britain and France in fact building a peace front to halt Germany and Italy? If so, why have negotiations with Soviet Russia not yet succeeded after more than twelve weeks? If we join a peace front in July, what guarantee have we that there won't be a second Munich in August? What solution does the "peace front" offer for the problems by which the world is confronted? What are its proposals as to armament, colonies, raw materials, tariffs, the still unliquidated bad clauses of the Treaty of Versailles? What guarantees are we given that American support will not be used to back up an attitude as bitterly unyielding and as self-seeking as was that of Great Britain and France in 1919?

Cotton for Rubber

The United States and Great Britain have acted sensibly in agreeing to exchange 85,000 tons of British rubber for 150,000 tons of American cotton. In both cases the shipments received will be treated as emergency war supplies. They won't be put on the market until age threatens deterioration, when they will be sold cautiously and replaced by equal amounts. Our sale of cotton will not help us much with a surplus of 3,500,000 tons, but rubber is an indispensable imported raw material and if the high seas were closed or partly closed to us because of war, we would face catastrophe. We should now go ahead with all possible speed and build up reserve stocks of other essential raw materials as well. Experts who studied the matter intensively say that for a hundred million dollars we could safeguard ourselves against a war of several years' duration.

Silver Threads Among the Gold

The owners of silver mines in the Western states want to sell their product at the highest possible price. Already the government is buying it far above the world market price, at 64.64 cents an ounce. Now the Senate has been induced, by the Western silver Senators, to vote to buy it at 77.57 cents. The silver is of no use to anybody, least of all to the government. It is not even a necessary part of the monetary reserve like gold. One or two arguments can be made for this policy—such as that we have helped Mexico by buying her silver and that it is a way of spending money and keeping miners employed. But the new bill forbids us to buy any more foreign silver. And why not keep people

The motives of the Western Senators who put over this fast one are low but understandable. But what are we to say of the anti-New Deal Eastern Democrats and Republicans who traded votes in support of this measure for votes to end the President's power to devalue the dollar? Devaluation is a dormant issue; the President certainly would not devalue again unless there were a marked depreciation of foreign currencies. The only argument for repeal of this power is the stern financial rectitude of orthodox worshippers of the gold standard. But these very high priests of sound money and economy supplied the votes to put over the silver steal!

We hereby make a proposal to the Republocrats and Democans in Congress. If you will vote for a bill compelling the government to buy, at 30 cents a copy (regular price, 15 cents), as many copies of *The New Republic* as we can print, we will put our tongues in our cheeks and support your attack on the WPA.

We Must Help the Children

Amid all the talk of filibusters and pressure for early adjournment, Congress has one duty it must not overlook: it must pass the Wagner-Rogers Bill. This proposal would admit to the United States 10,000 German refugee children under fourteen years of age in 1939 and a similar number in 1940. These children are Jews, Catholics and Protestants. They must pass all the physical and mental requirements of our immigration law. There is no possibility of their becoming public charges, since every one would be placed in a home with responsible foster parents; thousands of persons have asked for this privilege. The plan would cost the government not one cent; it would be operated by the American Friends' Service Committee and the International Migration Service. The families from which these children come would not be broken up by the plan; every possible effort would be made to keep in touch with the parents. In many cases, however, the children come from homes already smashed by the Nazis. The horrors of life for a rejected child in Germany are almost beyond an American's imagination. As Clarence Pickett of the Friends' Service Committee has said:

The child cannot go to the state schools. Lacking a school, he also lacks all of the legitimate outlets for play. The parks are closed to him. He walks on the streets only at the risk of being taunted or spat on by other children or perhaps beaten by his elders. Even in his home the tension and pressure of the environment are upon him. . . . There is the crashing of glass at any time of the day or night when the neighboring rowdies choose to throw stones through the windows. There is terror at a mere knock on the door.

There are no decent arguments against this bill. When it is passed, we shall have done no more in proportion to our size and wealth than has already been

Scandinavian countries. No member of Congress can vote against this bill for reasons of which he is not ashamed. We suggest that you write to your own representatives in both Houses and remind them of this fact.

Woodrum

Like the Federal Theatre actors whose jobs he would take away, Representative Clifton A. Woodrum used to sing for his supper. He came to Congress sixteen years ago, weedy, unobtrusive, pious-looking, from Roanoke, Virginia, fief of the big tobacco companies. His sole discoverable gift was an ability to sing "Carry Me Back to Ole Virginny" in a way to reduce elderly House members from the farm states to tears. The late Mr. William P. Connery Jr., ex-vaudeville player and chairman of the Labor Committee, was official song-leader at congressional gatherings, but Woodrum was asked along for his specialty. In time, he became one of Mr. Garner's bright legislative pupils. But he was first heard from only after Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated and put forward his economy bill, cutting government pay checks and veterans' benefits. Woodrum was a leader in that fight, and was booed on the House floor. He is today heavy-set, authoritative, but his pious manner remains intact. He has eyes like those of a bank cashier seeking an overdrawn customer, but from his mouth come none of the bitter denunciations of the New Deal uttered, for example, by Mr. Cox of Georgia. He is mild, ingratiating, filled with praise for Mr. Roosevelt. His leadership of the House members from the farm states against the WPA appropriation bill was a pinnacle of the politician's oily art. New York's unemployment problem is infinitely worse, more complicated, than ours in Roanoke, he told his fellows, but New York mustn't run away with the program. Unexceptional words, but—at least as far as the House is concerned—a program on which three million unemployed depend was torn to ribbons.

The NLRB Amends Itself

The day after Joseph C. Gall, counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers, had objected to its "inequity" to employers, the National Labor Relations Board announced that it was overhauling its rules. It made one change right off the bat; from now on an employer will be allowed to appeal for an election to determine with what union group he should bargain collectively, in cases where no labor group has petitioned for certification as the appropriate bargaining unit. It had been feared previously that under such a provision an employer could wreck an organizing campaign, by holding an election just as soon as it began. But the experience of the New York State Labor Relations Board has shown that this possibility can be avoided.

Those who are urging amendment of the National

change in the NLRB rules isn't important, although it was previously one of their first demands. Their attitude in this instance is revealing; it makes clear that they don't want to make procedural adjustments, but to hamstring the Act. By throwing it open to amendment they hope to obtain changes that would defeat its very purpose.

Homer Martin Makes Trouble for AFL

The AFL is discovering now that at least some of the charges made against Homer Martin last January by the executive board of the United Auto Workers, CIO, were well founded. For similar charges have been made against him by the executive board of his own secessionist UAW—who can hardly be accused of being "stooges of the dictator Lewis," as was said of Martin's previous critics. These men, who followed him out of the CIO, declare that he called the recent strike in General Motors plants without the knowledge of the executive board and without previously consulting the leaders of the locals involved, who were amazed to get strike orders late at night and without previous warning. Then he chartered a plane and flew to Kansas City, thereby making it impossible for himself to direct the strike from the desirable post at the center of the industry. The executive board further complains that, although the salaries of office employees and the organizing staff were in arrears, and although they asked him not to, Martin insisted on buying himself additional radio time to speak. It is reported that some of the leaders of Martin's union want to go back into the UAW-CIO.

The AFL is worried, for fear Martin will split even the small union that belongs to him. Yet they admitted his union to the AFL knowing he was a trouble-maker. They supported him in the hope that he would make trouble for the CIO. Now that he is making trouble for the AFL they should certainly not be surprised. We aren't.

Footnote to Tientsin

On January 16, 1885, Arthur Nicolson, then the British chargé d'affaires in Athens, was stopped on a little mountain path and struck several blows with a stick by an addlepat Greek gendarme. Nicolson furiously complained to the Greek government, and in a few hours the offending gendarme had been arrested. According to the account of the incident in Harold Nicolson's "Portrait of a Diplomatist," an official note of apology was presented from the Greek government, and the King sent his aide-de-camp to express regret. Nicolson insisted, further, that the gendarme should be publicly dismissed and an order of the day read to the assembled gendarmes stating the reasons for dismissal. To this the Greek government agreed.

Unfortunately, the order of the day, as published,

chargé d'affaires then demanded that a new order of the day be drafted. This was read to the gendarmes, drawn up in the Place de la Constitution. At the close of the ceremony, in the presence of the British consul, the band played "God Save the King."

The diplomats in Whitehall thought Nicolson had gone "a little beyond what was quite necessary," but his action was officially supported. Of course this all took place in 1885.

A Mexican Airman's Funeral

Francisco Sarabia, Mexico's great air hero, was killed a few weeks ago in an airplane accident in Washington, D. C. Riots in Mexico City followed, based on the idea that Americans had murdered him through sabotage of his plane. When his body was returned to Mexico City in an American military airplane, the aviators were stoned. It is important to know that this anti-American feeling was not spontaneous, but was worked up by German and Italian propagandists. Incendiary speeches were made by Joel Torres, a Mexican Fascist with close German connections. University students received floods of letters from Germans and Italians in Mexico; the letters, on a supposed basis of secret information from the consulates of these nations in Washington, charged the Americans had murdered Sarabia. Pro-Fascist newspapers in Mexico City made the same charges, even resorting to faked interviews with well known Mexicans. Luckily, the German propagandists blundered, as they often do. The stoning of the aviators seemed to the proud and hospitable Mexicans an act of barbarism and brought in its wake a spontaneous outburst of pro-American feeling.

History Moves in Cycles

We can remember vividly the first days of radio. Our set, a Radiola, had two tubes sticking up in back, a pair of headphones and enough batteries of one sort and another on the floor to power a lighthouse. Not long afterward the batteries were done away with. Our next set was slightly inferior as far as reception went; its beauty was that you could simply plug it into the electric-light socket, like a bridge lamp. Then, only this spring, the radio industry moved on and left us, once more, in the lurch. The latest thing, the advertisements said, was a wonderful new set, complete with batteries, that did away with the old-fashioned notion of plugging wires into the wall. If we wanted to, they said, we could take it on our picnics. Well, sir, we had our sandwiches made and the thermos bottle filled, and were on our way into the store to buy one of these new-fangled portables when the window display caught our eye. "Sensational!" the sign read. "1940 Model Radio. Plays entirely without batteries. AC-DC. Just plug in light socket!" We are trying to dispose of a basketful of sandwiches. No reasonable offer will be

News Notes of a Week

Britain advanced the date for her naval maneuvers to August, instead of the usual September. Italy ordered the strategic highway she is building across Albania completed by the end of August. There were other preparations for a crisis at the end of summer. . . . In Bohemia and Moravia, Jews—defined as those who have three or more full Jewish grandparents, or have two full Jewish grandparents and have themselves since March 17 been members of the Jewish faith, or have married such persons—were ordered to report themselves and register their property, both personal and business, with the German commissioners. They were told they must obtain the written permission of Baron von Neurath by July 31 if they were to continue in business. . . . William Strang, the special British envoy, was waiting in Moscow for new instructions from London concerning the Anglo-Soviet pact negotiations. London's prevailing opinion was that England would slowly and unwillingly meet the Russian terms. . . . Both sides agreed that there had been heavy fighting on the Manchukuo-Outer Mongolia border since May 11. Russia reported that Soviet Mongolian planes had downed 84 Japanese, losing 26; the Japanese claimed 128 Mongolian planes.

Amid the rumors and scandal that followed formal charges of embezzlement of \$100,000 against President James M. Smith of Louisiana State University, Earl K. Long, the brother of former boss Huey P. Long, was sworn in as Governor of Louisiana. Governor Richard W. Leche had accepted his own resignation. Mr. Smith had disappeared. . . . The Chicago Newspaper Guild and the Chicago Typographical Union agreed that there existed no jurisdictional dispute between them, as was claimed in regard to the strike against the Hearst papers. The estimated loss in advertising revenue for the Hearst papers in the strike was announced to be nearly \$1,600,000.

Recovery by Investment

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT's proposal to Congress of a revolving "recovery fund" to stimulate industrial activity is sound in principle, and is in accord with many recent suggestions, including those advanced by The New Republic. As a beginning and an expression of a line of action, it deserves hearty support by all progressives. In detail, however, it is faulty and insufficient. Much more than this will be needed if anything like full employment is to be achieved.

In principle it recognizes the indubitable fact that the chief lag in recovery lies in the expansion of new investment in durable goods, and that the credit resources for such expansion are lying idle in the banks. Since private enterprise will not or cannot utilize this

must step in and do so. This is not just hit-or-miss "spending," but investment to create goods of lasting value and to fill a specific gap in the operation of our economy.

The method of accounting proposed for this activity, though somewhat novel in practice in the United States, is already in use by the RFC and other governmental credit agencies. It was suggested long ago by The New Republic and others, and is successfully established in Sweden and elsewhere. The investments are not to be charged as expenditures against the general budget. They are to be made by separate governmental agencies, which are to borrow their own money—their bonds being guaranteed by the government. This is equivalent to the sanctioned corporate practice of maintaining a capital account separate from the account of current income and outgo. Borrowings for capital purposes are not entered in the income account but appear only as liabilities in the capital account. Investments made out of these borrowings likewise appear, as assets, in the capital account only. Income from the investments and payments of interest of course are recorded in the income account.

This bookkeeping device is not for the purpose of kidding anybody about government spending or an unbalanced budget. On the contrary, the citizen is misled if he regards spending for sound investments out of borrowed money as an increase in the operating deficit. Let us take the parallel case of a corporation which, let us say, makes \$1,000,000 on its operations during a year, and at the same time borrows \$4,000,000 which it invests in new plant. Would not the stockholders be deceived if they supposed the corporation was therefore \$3,000,000 in the red and bound for bankruptcy?

The investments are supposed to be "self-liquidating." If they are not, then the government will have to make good its guarantee and the debt will indeed become an addition to the operating deficit and a burden on the taxpayer. But the question here concerns the soundness of the specific investments to be made rather than the principle.

Our first misgiving about the measure has to do with the size of the fund. It is to total \$3,860,000,000—in itself nowhere near enough to make up for the deficiency of private investment. And this is to be spent over a period of years, with a limit for the first twelve months of \$870,000,000. That is not enough to bring much recovery.

Our second doubt has to do with the nature of some of the projects. Local public works of a self-liquidating nature form the first category. Are localities likely to undertake enough of these, especially after they have been privileged to receive grants of 45 per cent of the cost of such projects from the PWA? The second category consists of express toll roads, bridges, by-passes and the like. So far so good, except for the

by tolls. The third category would lend money to tenant farmers to buy farms. There is a real danger of loss here, in view of the fact that agriculture has been so unprofitable that many of the present tenants were formerly owners and lost their farms. Rural electrification, the fourth group, is thoroughly good, though the possibility of spending money on self-supporting projects is limited. The best in the list is probably the fifth—a corporation to buy railroad equipment and rent it out to the roads. The railroads need new equipment badly and often cannot themselves raise the money to buy it. Finally come loans to foreign governments to facilitate trade. Such loans are certainly not safe investments. They may be justified politically, as an offset to Nazi penetration, but they hardly belong in this bill. Of course they may help to reduce unemployment in this country.

What the country needs is a more ambitious program in this field. There is almost no limit to the money that could safely be invested in good, low-priced housing under governmental auspices. A coördinated program for national expansion of utilities would do a great deal. The President's proposal touches such a project only at two edges—local public works, which may include publicly owned utilities, and rural electrification. Finally, we need a real overhauling of the railroads that would permit them to charge such low fares and offer such good service that they would need a large new capital expenditure.

Washington's Third Term

AS 1940 DRAWS NEARER, we shall probably hear more and more discussion of the third-term issue. A strong weapon of those who oppose it is the tradition against it, and the supposed antagonism of the Founding Fathers, chief among them George Washington. Mr. J. J. Perling of Washington, D. C., has been looking into the record and believes that this opposition has been greatly overrated. In a recent pamphlet he points out that Washington was opposed to putting into the Constitution itself any restriction on the number of terms a President could serve. After the Constitutional Convention was over he wrote to General Lafayette, saying, "I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who, on some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

It is true that after two terms in office he objected to having a third, but Mr. Perling points out that this was because the President was getting on in years, was tired out, and greatly disliked being obliged to live in New York, which was then the national capital. It is well known that after his first term he was almost equally

was written, in part at least, before the first term had expired.

Thomas Jefferson was opposed to "the *perpetual* reëligibility of the President" which he feared would "make the office for life first and then hereditary." He wrote this statement from France, where he had been greatly impressed with the mediocrity of European rulers. Nevertheless, he was himself prepared to serve a third term in case of deep emergency. In a letter to John Taylor in 1805, he said: "There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election: to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist."

Gouverneur Morris, another of the Founding Fathers, who drafted the Constitution, wrote to Washington urging him to accept a third term. "But you may say that you stand indirectly pledged to private life. Surely, Sir, you never gave, nor meant to give such a pledge, to the extent of possible contingencies." During the Constitutional Convention those who argued against a definite limitation on the number of terms included Rufus King, Alexander Hamilton and others. Most of the arguments against a third term have been based on tradition. Mr. Perling's researches show that their base is shaky.

Churches in Spain

WORD COMES from the home office of the Spanish Gospel Mission in London that all Protestant churches in Barcelona were closed when Franco took over the city. Permission to reopen them has been denied. These are churches that remained open and unmolested throughout the war under the allegedly "godless" Republic. In another Catalan town the Protestant chapel was requisitioned by the Rebel authorities and turned over to a Catholic Action group. The military censor has thus far prevented the Mission from receiving anything more than these fragmentary reports of what has happened in former Loyalist territory, but it views the future of Protestantism in Spain with apprehension. General Franco is restoring the property and traditional status of the Catholic Church, which includes return of all cemeteries to the Church and all questions concerning burial to her jurisdiction. Marriages also will probably be affected. The seriousness of this, says the Mission's report, will be realized by "anyone who knows the trouble Protestants had over these matters in the days of the monarchy." Correspondents of the Catholic press in Spain, who have concerned themselves considerably with religious persecution, have been strangely silent on these developments.

Though General Franco has made generous concessions to the Catholic Church for the help it gave him

there is visible the encroaching shadow of the swastika on the cross. This is pointed out by the correspondent of The London Times. In a detailed analysis (written outside Spain) he reports that Franco's Rightist supporters are "sharply divided" and that "intrigue and rancor are now more rife than in the darkest moments of the civil war."

More ominous is the fact that the Falangist (Fascist) Party, the only political group now permitted, is increasingly aping Nazism. In its hierarchy "sit many devotees of the sophisticated cult of Fascist violence which has aroused the apprehension of the Spanish bishops. There the Church problem is discussed in terms coined during the past few years in Nazi Germany, where many of the party leaders have undergone periods of training. In spite of all official emphasis on the Catholic traditions of Spain—the name of José Antonio Primo de Rivera, the founder of the Falange, has been inscribed by order on the walls of every Spanish cathedral—there is a strong undercurrent of revolutionary anti-clericalism which has not been dammed."

General Franco has destroyed education, as we know it: "A large majority of the university professors and schoolmasters were adherents of the Republican cause, and are now either in exile or jail." Thus education is again a virtual Catholic monopoly in Spain, which may be regarded by some as a victory for the Church (under the monarchy it had control of education and was responsible for the unenviable fact that Spain had by far the worst illiteracy rate in Europe—52 percent of the population as late as 1931). But what will happen to this "victory" as the Spanish Fascists attempt to consolidate their position and "unify" Spain? Certainly the experiences in Austria and Germany afford a disturbing lesson. No doubt that is why the Spanish bishops are suddenly becoming apprehensive—perhaps too late.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

JAMES BENÉT BRUCE BLIVEN JR. H. N. BRAILSFORD
HEYWOOD BROWN JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK
E. C. LINDEMAN JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD
Advertising Manager

BYRON DEXTER
Circulation Manager

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS;

Who's Ahead in China?

WHEN I RETURNED from the Far East in 1937, two months after the war between China and Japan had begun, I wrote in *The New Republic* that the war would last at least one year, more likely two years and probably three years. That may have seemed far-drawn then. In the light of what has since happened it was rather an understatement. Two years of the war have passed and there is little prospect of its being brought to a conclusion in the coming year. The Chinese show no signs of collapse or disposition to make voluntary surrender. The Japanese show no signs of ability to bring them to either state by military force. Officially the Japanese may talk about the military phase being over and the period of reconstruction of the Far East having begun; unofficially they know that they must continue on a full war footing for years. Privately they are acknowledging that Japan must maintain an occupying force of 500,000 men in China for at least five years, perhaps ten. This they believe, or profess to believe, that Japan can sustain without succumbing to the strain. Others, the writer included, believe that they cannot. Here the issue of the war lies.

The progress of the war can be summarized briefly. Tactically Japan has been almost uniformly victorious. Strategically she has been held to a stalemate at best. Politically she has been completely defeated and, therefore, economically defeated too, a serious matter, since that touches Japan at her vulnerable point. In the article from which I have already quoted I said that the determining factors in the outcome of the war would be "the lasting power of China's morale under horrible suffering, Japan's economic lasting power under a stress that is by normal criteria unbearable and the chance of military intervention by a third power." Those are still the determining factors. So far as the first two are concerned, China is wearing at least as well as Japan. Both have stood up better than might have been expected, China because the cumulative effect of Japanese aggressions had already welded her into an unprecedented unity and because Japanese excesses in the war diffused national consciousness where it had not been before, and Japan because the economic semi-dictatorship has conserved national resources. But because those two factors are so evenly balanced, the relative weight of the third is greater, with some modification for what has happened in the international scene in the last two years. In fact, just now it is difficult to see any early conclusion to the war except through its absorption in a general war. This is particularly true of Japan. She cannot win in China; she could not and for a long time need not admit defeat. She can extricate herself only by plunging into a world war—if one comes—and gam-

Tactically Japan has been victorious in that she has won battles and territory and driven the Chinese organized armies out of more than half the country. But strategically she has been unsuccessful in that her victories and territorial advances have gained her nothing. The Chinese army retreats, reforms and prepares to fight on another line. The Japanese have no choice but to push on in the hope, still vain, of destroying or dispersing or capturing it at some other point.

This has had two results unfortunate for the Japanese. In the first place, it extends their lines of communication over a large part of a continent and compels them to maintain a chain of garrisons over some 600,000 square miles. In the second place, it leaves the larger part of nominally occupied China actually under independent Chinese control and overrun with guerilla forces, partisan bands or regular army troops deployed in small units for mobile warfare. Technically, eleven provinces are under Japanese occupation. It is estimated that actually more than two-thirds of the district administrative units in those provinces are governed by magistrates appointed by the Chinese national government, much as they were before the war. It is now a commonplace that Japanese authority does not run twenty miles beyond the garrison points. The Japanese have not come near the beginning of an administrative organization which can exercise authority, administer the country or take any advantage of its resources. They are not remotely near the beginning of genuine pacification.

More important than political failure is the unorganized resistance behind the lines. Guerilla warfare has become a catchword. It has been the subject of a great deal of loose writing and talking, of romanticization, exaggerations and wishful thinking. And it has given rise to a great deal of oversimplification. But when all these are shorn away, it remains the crux of the war. China will escape servitude to Japan in so far as she can continue mobile warfare behind the Japanese lines, whether of communist armies, loosely organized bands of local inhabitants bent on harassing the Japanese in revenge or the regular army broken into small units for more effective resistance.

On this subject there is considerable controversy. By all orthodox military criteria, whether Japanese, European or American, guerilla warfare cannot be successful. But, in the first place, it should be observed that orthodox military judgments are nearly always wrong on all wars except those of forty years ago or more. In the second place, orthodox military judgments have been completely wrong on the course of the present war. By all the proper canons the war should have

China and Nanking if necessary and, having gained their objectives, consolidate and proceed to exploit the conquered territory. By any other precepts than classical military analogy it could have been assumed that they would not do so. So long as the Chinese were massed near by, the Japanese could not consolidate and withdraw most of their expedition. And they would not want to do so, since their pride would be galled. The Japanese have been driven to recklessness as much by injured vanity as by need. They could not swallow the humiliation of "disorderly" Chinese withstanding Japanese arms. They had to keep on fighting, though their objectives were gained.

Military theory may be proved equally fallacious with respect to Chinese guerilla resistance. For one thing, China still has more than guerilla forces to rely on. If she had not, then sporadic attacks by half-armed, barely disciplined bands might prove unavailing against highly organized, mechanized armies. But China has an organized army, numbering at least a million men, perhaps two million. They are ill provided with modern accouterments of warfare, but they have enough to take a heavy toll of offensive forces advancing in difficult terrain. And if a part of this army is divided and distributed about the country at strategic points behind Japanese lines they can keep the Japanese steadily engaged. The question of supplies is undoubtedly serious, but not insoluble. For mobile warfare the more costly and complicated weapons are not necessary. Light armament is enough. Supplies of such armament have already held out longer than had been expected, though there have been grave deficiencies; and their continued replenishment, while difficult, is not impossible. The country is not entirely shut off and is not likely to be, and judiciously provided credits from other countries can enable it to purchase what is indispensable.

How much have the guerillas accomplished so far? Probably the most accurate answer is that they have accomplished less than is claimed for them by China's partisans and more than the Japanese admit. It is undeniable that they have pinned the Japanese to their garrison posts, prevented them from withdrawing most of their forces, compelled them to undertake numerous mopping-up campaigns—sometimes in areas previously conquered—and prevented them from getting at the resources of the occupied provinces or selling goods there. In unguarded moments the Japanese have officially admitted that in some regions nominally occupied for more than a year they have had to fight an average of two engagements a day over a period of months. By all the signs now visible there is no prospect of guerilla warfare being put down in the near future. On the contrary, it is extending its range and increasing in effectiveness.

The essential point is that by reason of guerilla resistance Japan can get little or nothing out of her mili-

Actually she has got no more since the war than she could have got by open purchase, probably less. All her planned enterprises for China's exploitation, the numberless official and semi-official companies, still exist mainly on paper. These cannot get started, not only because the necessary capital is lacking but also because they could not operate outside garrison posts without their representatives being massacred. Only a few satellites of the army, carpet-baggers, minor profiteers and camp-followers are doing particularly well out of the occupation. By dog-in-the-manger tactics the Japanese have managed to hamstring European and American traders in China, but they themselves have not benefited proportionately.

Japan has sold little more to China than she would have sold under normal conditions. In value she has sold less, for by outlawing Chinese currency in North China and pegging the so-called Federal Reserve notes to the Japanese yen, Japan has deprived herself of the foreign exchange she would normally get from exports to China. Thus the attack on Chinese currency has proved a boomerang which hits Japan where she is weakest when she is weakest. Japanese goods may pour into China under the guise of army supplies while waterways are closed to foreign shipping and cargoes, but she is being paid for her goods in worthless notes of her own printing. And the goods she pours in remain within the shadow of Japanese guns. Outside the range of the guns the Chinese market is closed.

It is obvious that there is a limit to how long Japan can continue a war which requires her to maintain a million men on the Asiatic continent, and all the evidence points to the conclusion that the limit is steadily drawing nearer. Japanese official boasts that the country is coming through, based on the so-called balance of trade last year, are groundless. Japan's exports, it is true, were slightly in excess of imports. But included in the exports were goods sold to the so-called yen-bloc, Manchukuo and North China. Such sales contributed nothing to Japan's foreign exchange, and on her ability to solve the exchange problem Japan will stand or fall.

Under the best of circumstances Japan's is an economy inherently unbalanced. An unhealthily accelerated industrialization leaves her almost completely at the mercy of foreign trade. Her industrial establishment can be maintained only by imported raw materials, and these she can pay for only by exports, all of which, excepting only raw silk, must be products manufactured out of the raw materials imported. So long as raw materials are used primarily for the manufacture of exports, and export prices hold up enough to yield a profit on the transaction, the country is economically sound even if far from socially healthy. But when raw materials are used primarily for consumption in continental warfare as they now are, then there are not ex-

ports to pay for the raw-material imports and Japan must pay with gold. The two figures to watch, if one wishes to gauge Japan's viability, are her exports and her gold supply.

Yen-bloc countries included, Japan's exports fell off 16 percent in 1938; but if only those countries are included from which Japan gets foreign exchange in payment, exports fell off by nearly 33 percent. Taking the countries with which Japan must deal in foreign exchange, Japan's imports were nearly 500,000,000 yen larger than exports. The balance must be paid in gold, less certain invisible items, which also are shrinking. As to gold supply, it is impossible to make definite statements, since Japanese figures are now guarded or willfully distorted. But the most optimistic calculations do not give the country more than 500,000,000 yen left by now. New gold mined in the country comes to some 200,000,000 yen a year. Therefore, at the current rate Japan should be near the bottom of her gold supply in not much more than another year. After that she can pay for raw materials only with exports—at a time when tariff barriers are going up rather than down and she is facing increasing price handicaps on account of higher taxes and costs of production because of the war. But since so large a proportion of imported raw materials must be allocated for war purposes, exports must continue to shrink, and at an increasingly greater rate. As exports shrink, imports shrink, and then exports shrink still further. Then Japan's real difficulties will begin at home and, still more, her difficulties in China, for then the superiority in equipment

will narrow. Then Japan's only avenue of escape will be the resources she can extract from China, which brings the question back to whether Japan can establish political control as well as military ascendancy in China.

This is the course the war has taken from the beginning. And as it goes forward, its focal point tends to move out of the Far East. It is not fanciful to foresee the Japanese in desperation creating a hold, by which to lift themselves out of the slough, with some reckless act in Siberia, in southern waters that wash British, French and American possessions, or in foreign settlements in China. For the present Japan will doubtless continue to hope for the outbreak of a European war, in which she could capitalize on her neutrality by blackmailing both sides, or extract handsome compensation in return for allegiance to one side. Compensation would be the concession of a free hand in Eastern Asia, and provision of credits with which to get the means of crushing China by outlasting the Chinese. But for the present Japan is not committing herself unreservedly to her Fascist quasi-allies. To do so is to forfeit means of blackmail without any immediate return, for neither Germany nor Italy can help Japan much now or, in all probability, would be willing to do so. For Germany and Italy must also remain in a position to hold the Japanese in line by blackmail when the test comes. Neither the axis Powers nor Japan trust each other, doubtless with reason. Finally, then, if there is to be any early conclusion of the China-Japan war, it can come only through the beginning of a European war.

NATHANIEL PEPPER

Inside Franco's Spain

OVER ACROSS THE SPANISH FRONTIER human sorrow and tragedy keep company. The world at large does not know, because the frontiers are hermetically sealed to the press. Only occasionally a suggestion of the truth comes through in some press report telling of generals, deputies and governors being shot for the crimes of being Republican and loyal to the elected government. But in one way or another the facts do reach those in closer contact with Spain, particularly that huge army of refugees who, in Paris and elsewhere, are struggling to find a new life. Refugees are still coming, secretly, through the mountain passes. And not all persons holding positions of trust under Franco are devoid of sentiment; some of them, traveling back and forth between Barcelona and Paris, tell refugee friends the facts. Letters manage to evade the censor and reach the refugees, perhaps written as if from an enthusiastic admirer of Franco, but concealing in the fulsome praise a little of the truth.

Not all of Franco's censors are blind, and in some

ter whose writer was eloquent in explaining the many benefits Franco had conferred on him and his fellow Spaniards. On the margin the censor, who had passed the letter, had written, "Don't waste so many circumlocutions in order to call Franco a 'cabrón.'" "Cabron" is the most insulting name in Spanish.

The letters and the new refugees tell the same story of terror. All persons who have some member of their family as a refugee in France have been ordered to stay in their homes, except for one hour a day for errands and purchases. They are thus on hand at all times for a domiciliary visit by the police, who customarily take or destroy every document in the place, and have often destroyed, wrecked, burned or stolen household articles, furniture, clothing and the like, leaving the victim to beg.

Among the "criminals" executed by Franco are General Aranguren of the Civil Guard, who persuaded the Civil Guard in Barcelona to remain loyal, and thus prevented the success of the rising there; General Liano

Barcelona, of which he was commanding general; Lieutenant-Colonel Pedro Rodriguez Gomez, who also remained loyal to the Republic; Berenger de las Cagigas, auditor general of the navy and a member of the supreme court, which under the constitution included military and naval officers, who remained loyal (his case is particularly sad, as he was confident that nothing would happen to him), and Supreme Court Judge Xavier de Elola, who, like all these others, had remained faithful to his duty under the constitution and the elected government.

Among others condemned to death was Lieutenant-Colonel Aymat, who had defended the Rebel General Goded at his Barcelona trial. This seems to have been considered an extenuating circumstance, for his death sentence was commuted to thirty years on Good Friday.

In Catalonia everything Catalan has been suppressed. All Catalan newspapers have been prohibited. Catalan art in most of its forms, such as music, the dance, the drama, literature, is forbidden or destroyed. The Barcelona Ateneo, housed in a spacious building which, with its garden and patio, its various lounging and assembly and reading rooms and its extensive library, has long been the center of Barcelona's intellectual life, is now under the heel of "Nationalist" unification. Its Catalan, Republican and liberal books have been weeded out and destroyed, as has been done in all Catalan bookstores.

In Barcelona there is an important cultural institution known as the Fundació Bernat Metges. It is the handiwork of the Catalan financier and millionaire, Francesc Cambó, founder and for many years head of the Catalan rightist party that in pre-Republican days was known as the Lliga Regionalista and latterly as the Lliga Catalana, popularly called simply "La Lliga." The Lliga represented property and conservatism. At elections it usually came to an understanding with monarchists and other rightists and commonly had a tie-up with the Church. Cambó in his earlier political career was a liberal, and even though, politically, he followed the trajectory toward conservatism and reaction so common to liberal leaders who become influential and wealthy, he continued to be a patron of Catalan culture. He generously endowed and supported the Fundació Bernat Metges. It published many Catalan books of first quality, often in de-luxe editions, concentrating especially on the translation into Catalan of the Scriptures and the Latin and Greek classics. These books have now been destroyed.

A letter which I have just received from a former Barcelona editor-in-chief now in exile, a man of conservative Republican principles, is worth quoting:

The brothers ———, of ———, one of the most distinguished and influential families of their region, have arrived at Perpignan. One is a writer of note and the other is

Unión Democrática de Cataluña, the party of Carrasco Formiguera, executed in Burgos, and those of the Acció Catalana. . . .

The Unión Democrática was a completely Catholic party having priests among its members. It was liberal and Republican and not in harmony with the political ambitions of the Church in Spain. Carrasco Formiguera, a distinguished layman whose Catholicism no one could have called into question, was captured during the war while en route to Bilbao on a mission from the Catalan to the Basque government. Although a civilian prisoner of war, he was executed by Franco. Acció Catalana was the next oldest Catalan party after the Lliga, and in pre-Republican days the greatest in popular strength. It was a center party, more liberal than the Lliga and more conservative than the leading Catalan party known as the Esquerra, with which it was in constant opposition until 1936, when it joined the Popular Front.

The letter continues:

The well known Librería de Cataluña [a famous book store] has been obliged to change its name. That well known café, the Maison Dorée, is now the Café d'España, because French names are no longer tolerated either. Several civil guards have been assassinated in the streets. [This would indicate popular reprisals against these classic instruments of official repression.]

Every month both Franco and Republican soldiers pass over the mountains into France as well as persons of the right, including staunch Catholics who are at the same time Catalanistas [Catalan patriots].

The conflict between the Falangistas and the Requetés is intense. The Falangistas closed the quarters of the Requetés at Lérida. In the Ritz Hotel of Barcelona there was a great battle between the Falangistas and the Requetés. The Falange chief, Manuel Calvino, son of the military governor of Manresa, was beaten up.

In Barcelona they neither eat nor work. Only the military men and those in authority eat well. They are also the ones who go to the theatres, cinemas and cafés, which are generally empty. Because there is no money, 90 percent of the people do not pay the rents, while they sell their radios and sewing machines. In the cinemas, at the intermissions, the Nationalist hymns are played and the members of the audience are obliged to stand up and salute. At one place a woman did not rise. There was then thrown on the screen a notice which said, "In such-and-such a row, and such-and-such a seat, a woman did not rise. The hymns will be repeated for her special benefit while the rest of the public will remain seated."

The Falangistas raid the apartments and take away the furniture—at least if they do not decide to live there themselves. They raided my own home, taking everything away but the walls.

It is estimated that 2,500 persons have been assassinated. Every day one hears new names, such as that of Salvador Albert, writer, deputy in the Cortes Constituyentes and former Ambassador in Brussels, who quit politics some time ago and lived in retirement in a town in the province

It will be recalled that Franco accepted the principle of restoring the monarchy, and this was one of the bases of the union between the Falange and the Requeté, imposed by Franco. It has already been noted that Falange and Requeté are at each other's throats. Franco wants to hear no more of monarchy, as he has sold himself the idea of being Spain's Führer. The Nazi influence on him is considerable. The monarchists are furious and have behind them the Requetés, who are also monarchists of the Carlist persuasion, with a tendency to support the monarchists' candidate for King, the Infante, Don Juan. The monarchists are becoming more benign toward the Republicans, bidding for sympathy, and many Republicans, convinced that the Republican cause is completely lost, are swinging toward the idea of a constitutional monarchy with ample guarantees. Persecuted Catalans are boycotting the Falange and entering the ranks of the Requeté, their own organization being outlawed. There is discontent among the military leaders who, as is characteristic of the Spanish military mind, are hungering for position and power. Franco has thrown a sop to four generals, Dávila, Queipo de Llano, Saliquet and Orgaz, by naming them lieutenant-generals, a grade that had been abolished by the Republic. The official press hails this as the restoration of the "military hierarchy." Other generals sulk, for example Aranda, who has been relegated to distant Galicia. Queipo de Llano, late dic-

tator of Andalusia, is reported to be intriguing against Franco.

The erstwhile followers of Gil Robles, of Acción Católica and Acción Popular, are not happy. Franco wants none of the man who had aspirations to be a Führer on his own account. Gil Robles now sulks in Portugal. His *El Debate*, in its day the most unprincipled and mendacious of newspapers, has not been permitted to reappear, though it was commonly considered the mouthpiece of the Jesuit order. Nevertheless the Jesuits, who were in the vanguard of the crusade in favor of Franco during the war, and whose "general" or "black pope" attended, with ex-King Alfonso, a solemn mass of thanksgiving and *Te Deum* in Rome the day after Barcelona fell, are reported to have considerable influence. Many of their properties, confiscated by the Republic, have been restored to them. But there is much opposition, particularly on the part of the Falange, and so Franco seems obliged to go cautiously.

To those who have followed the fortunes of the imprisoned POUM leaders, it may be interesting to know that all escaped. Fate ordained that the prosecutor who had appeared against them, demanding their lives at their trial, should be cast among them during his flight. Expecting to be killed by them, he received their protection, and all reached France together.

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH

After the New Deal

IV: *A Program for America*¹

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY now faces the most severe test of its entire existence. It must not only meet the challenge of Fascist and Communist dictatorships, which deride us for our failure to restore prosperity and employment for all our workers, but it must renew the faith of its own people in its efficacy—must demonstrate that under the democratic process an economy of plenty, reemployment and adequate standards of living for all classes can be established and maintained. It must answer, not with excuses and explanations, but with immediate constructive action, the indictment under which it rests.

One count in the indictment is exemplified by the ranks of eleven to twelve million willing workers who have no jobs, whose numbers are augmented each year by thousands of young people reaching maturity without any hope of work or expectation of a normal future. The other is found in the industrial and business stagnation that has persisted since 1930.

Must Democracy Plead Guilty?—As yet we have done nothing fundamental about this situation, though it has confronted the nation for almost a decade. Partisan critics to the contrary, responsibility for this does not rest upon the New Deal. If President Roosevelt could have had his way, the NRA would have brought about industrial expansion with the main emphasis upon reemployment, and increased mass purchasing power based upon reasonable prices and profits. But in 1934, after the bankers and business leaders had been saved by the President from the results of their own folly and unenlightened selfishness, and our leading industries had again begun to show profits, the code authorities of the NRA—dominated by short-sighted Big Business men—refused to consider the President's urgings and inaugurated a regime of restricted production and controlled prices. As a consequence, the only recourse left to the New Deal was "pump-priming" of industry through government spending. This policy again did not meet with industrial coöperation, and has proved to be merely a palliative. It ceases to work, so

¹ This is the fourth article in a series. The first three, by George Soule, appeared in our issues of May 17, May 24 and June 7.

moment the flow from the Treasury spigot is turned down or off.

To establish an economy of plenty calls for greatly increased production of both durable and consumer goods, accompanied by a corresponding increase in mass buying power. This, in turn, necessitates not the scrapping of our present economic system, but its reconstruction and readjustment. We know that our physical and natural resources are sufficient to afford jobs for everyone able and willing to work if industry can be required to function in the public interest. This has been proved in scientific studies made by economists, engineers and other technicians during the past five years, including that of the Columbia University Committee on Economic Reconstruction and Harold Loeb's survey of national potential productive capacity.

The immediate problem of economic reconstruction, therefore, is to determine whether it can be brought about through the voluntary efforts of industry and business, or, on the other hand, through intervention and affirmative action by the federal government.

Can Industry Plan Itself?—Experience with "self-government by industry" under the NRA points to the immediate rejection of the first method. And there are additional reasons to reject it. Banking and industrial leadership cannot work out a plan through voluntary agreements that will coördinate the production of all the major industries, or even of the units within a single industry. The record of finance and business from 1920 to the present time proves it.

Even if a plan of industrial self-government were evolved, it would fail because all the parties to the agreement would not live up to its provisions, and could not be forced to do so without government action. Moreover, all proposals that industry and business be permitted to undertake the job are conditioned upon special favors to be granted by society as a whole, such as tax reductions or remissions, government loans or government guarantees of credits, and government spending for pump-priming and for work relief and direct relief to tide over the unemployment and industrial-stagnation emergency.

Finally, we know by experience that even if the financial and industrial interests put into effect a voluntary plan of industrial expansion and succeeded in raising the national productive output and reemployment to higher levels, we should still under their direction face a future of recurrent panics and depressions.

What Kind of Government Action?—Intervention and affirmative action by the government is, therefore, the only way to economic reconstruction. And when the government undertakes economic reconstruction it must be either through socialization of utilities and major industries, or through government regulation and con-

processes and within the framework of the present American business system.

Whatever our predilections may be, the first of these alternatives—socialization—must be rejected forthwith, since it is utterly impossible politically at the present time. The American people will not accept the principle of socialization until there has first been a thorough trial of reconstruction and readjustment through enlightened government regulation and control.

Full sanction and authority for this rebuilding of our economy are found in our democratic institutions and methods. The American people, through the expressed will and purpose of an unmistakable majority, can do anything they may desire to do with their political and economic structure. From time to time they have placed restrictions upon capitalism as it has increasingly dominated and directed the nation's economy.

We can have economic reconstruction, or, in more popular phraseology, reemployment and plenty, *if we want it*. The problem is one of deciding upon objectives and bringing forth a concrete proposal as a method of attaining them.

Objectives of Reconstruction.—The American Association for Economic Freedom is a tripartite organization sponsored by leading churchmen of all faiths, by eminent educators in our colleges and universities, and by representatives of various public groups. It has such a concrete proposal, worked out by its staff in collaboration with members of the Congress and economists, engineers and other experts, inside and outside the government service. Broadly speaking, its objectives are:

To safeguard and preserve democracy, as against fascism on the one hand and communism on the other;

To readjust our economic system so that it will function in the public interest;

To increase production so that we shall have employment for all employables at incomes assuring a national purchasing power that will absorb this increased production;

To increase the national income to the practicable maximum of our natural resources and productive capacities, thereby making possible both the elimination of pump-priming and work relief, and of direct relief save for unemployables, and the reduction of federal taxes; and

To provide credit for industry and business, large and small, through a system that will not permit the draining off of the profits of production by promotion devices that serve only the selfish few in our existing finance-banking set-up.

It will of course be far easier to gain approval and support of these objectives than it will be to bring about agreement upon the means of attaining them. But, as a matter of fact, the objectives are the important thing, and the method of gaining them is not at all important, provided it is practicable and effective. Moreover, we shall get nowhere if we wait for general agreement upon a plan. Agreement can be reached only by crystallization of sentiment, and by the long legislative

processes of public hearings, debate, committee work and amendment. The first step, as students of the problem see it, is to precipitate the fundamental issue by bringing forth a definite and complete proposal as a working basis.

For the specific plan outlined herein, it may be said that it is a complete proposal in all legislative details and forms. It leaves nothing "to be worked out"—a weakness of most of the plans thus far presented to the Congress and called to public notice. It is predicated upon the fundamental assumption that America's natural resources and productive capacities make possible an economy of full employment and abundance, and that, as has been demonstrated by a series of scientific inquiries, our national income can be increased to more than fifty billions above the 1929 record of eighty-one billions.

Other basic assumptions underlie the plan. All major industrial activities must be concertedly expanded in approximate balance; the growth, specialization and interdependence of our modern industries have made coördination as essential to the proper functioning of our economy as regulation is to our highway traffic. A first essential for prosperity in a highly specialized industrial economy such as ours is an adequate and continuous flow of commerce and exchange. The generation of reëmployment and purchasing power should be connected with production, and volumes of purchasing power maintained in approximate balance with increasing production. The plan proposes that our present system of private so-called investment bankers be eliminated and that the essential liquidity of available investment funds be assured by the establishment of a sound capital-issues banking system under a public control corresponding to that of our commercial banking system. It is assumed that prosperity must be based upon assurance of full employment and effective utilization of our available productive capacities; that businesses participating in interstate commerce or operating under corporate franchises have special obligations and must share responsibility for making opportunity of employment and access to means of livelihood available to all; that prosperity cannot be assured by any system of restraining industrial regulation and codes as provided in NRA, but must be attained by constructive coöperation in adequate programs of balanced production expansion.

The Administrative Framework.—New government agencies would have to be created to effectuate the plan. They include the following:

An Industrial Reconstruction Commission of seven members, to be appointed by the President; authorized and directed to administer the law, guided by the principle that the economic resources of the nation are to be utilized as

A National Planning Board of a director and six other members, to be appointed by the Commission; authorized and directed, under the Commission, to develop a general program for the coördination, stabilization and orderly expansion of the major industries in interstate commerce.

Industry Councils composed, in addition to representatives of the Planning Board, of equal representation of industry, labor and the public; to recommend expansion programs for their industries, subject to supervision, adjustment, coördination and application by the Commission.

An Assurance and Marketing Corporation of five members appointed by and subject to the Commission; to assist as directed by the Commission in such handling, carrying, warehousing, insuring, marketing and distributing of products as may be necessary; to assure industry against loss in realizing the actual necessary costs of increased production under quotas established by the Commission; to assist businesses in the procurement of bank credits needed to expand production in accordance with employment and expansion programs. To ensure funds to cover continuing costs of operation, a production-cost assurance tax of two percent on net value added in the major industries shall be collected by the government and applied by the Corporation and the Commission to the support and maintenance of the production-expansion programs and to provide for the retirement of any funded debt of the Corporation. Unneeded portions of the proceeds of this tax shall revert annually to the payers of the tax.

A Capital Issues Banking System with a Board of Governors composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the chairman of the Industrial Reconstruction Commission, and five members to be appointed by the President, one of the latter to be designated chairman; the principal office of the Capital Issues Banking System to be in Washington, with one Capital Issues Bank in each of the twelve Federal Reserve Districts.

The Capital Issues Banking System applies to institutions of investment banking and underwriting only, and provides a completely organized system in a field which, although vitally important to the general economy, has hitherto been abandoned to unregulated financial domination and exploitation by unsupervised private investment bankers and underwriters. The Securities and Exchange Commission exercises a limited supervision over the securities issued and the security exchanges, but not over the investment-banking concerns themselves.

No corporation, partnership, firm, organization or individual other than a capital-issues bank certified by the Capital Issues Banking Board shall be permitted to underwrite for sale or to sell or offer for sale, as a primary distributor, any security (other than an exempted security) entering into or affecting interstate commerce.

It shall be the function and purpose of capital-issues banks: (1) to facilitate the fiscal operations of the federal government; (2) to provide and assure the banking facilities and credits necessary to carry into effect the industrial

funds to meet the needs of legitimate business; (4) to underwrite and handle the primary distribution of new and replacement securities issued by such businesses; (5) to make advancements of secured capital loans to such businesses; (7) to purchase new and replacement securities for purposes of primary distribution; (8) to provide facilities, information and other assistance to aid investors in applying their funds to the purchase of sound securities representing actual capital investment; and (9) to form groups or syndicates, take subscriptions and conduct such other activities as may be necessary or helpful in the issuance, underwriting or marketing of eligible capital issues.

A Licensing System. No articles, commodities or goods produced in the major industries shall be shipped, transported or delivered in interstate commerce, if produced, manufactured, processed or distributed by any business which has not been licensed by the Industrial Reconstruction Commission. Provision is made for temporary licenses, and for blanket licenses covering all businesses in an industry. Every licensee shall undertake to comply with the production-expansion programs necessary to provide full employment, and any license may be suspended or revoked for violation of its conditions. The Commission may appoint a public trustee, or trustees, who, subject to the Commission, shall have full power to manage and conduct a business or industrial operation, not licensed, or which has had its license revoked or suspended. Such trusteeship shall not continue for a period of more than five years. Appeals from decisions of the Commission may be taken to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Plan's Result.—With these agencies operating in accordance with the fundamental principles of the proposed legislation, reemployment will be effected through the increased activities of the major industries under the expansion programs and through the reduction in working hours, where and as needed, to provide jobs for the nation's available manpower. Increased purchasing power to absorb increased production will come through the increased employment, through increases in wages and salaries, especially in the lower brackets, and through extension of credits to finance expansion programs.

Production costs will be lowered through technological efficiency and through reduced financing charges. Prices will be stabilized and unwarranted increases prevented, without actual price-fixing, but through the balanced expansion of production with relation to consumer needs, employment, payrolls, prices and capital expansion.

National income will be greatly augmented through increased production in the major industries and collaterally in all other industries. Agriculture will be relieved of the trend of industrial workers in a back-to-the-land movement, and will benefit through a wider and better market for farm products resulting from increased payrolls and higher standards of living for all especially for the large section of the population

Industrial and banking profits will decrease per unit of production, but will increase in volume and in relation to actual productive investment.

Fighting the Fog.—It is realized by the proponents of these objectives that overlying all hopes for economic reconstruction is the fog of ignorance, of misunderstanding and misinterpretation, of unenlightened opposition, of prejudice and of blind clinging to an old broken-down system in the belief that it is better to bear the ills we know than to risk a change, no matter what blessings it might bring to a troubled people and a distressed world. To dispel that fog will be a task, rather than a problem.

Those who believe in and will lead the movement for this epochal and necessary reform must expect misunderstanding of motives, and political and economic pressure such as have never before been known in this country. Their constructive efforts will be denounced as destructive. Only the spirit of the true crusader will carry them through the struggle that confronts them, and that struggle must be made the crusade that it really is—a crusade to save and preserve the democracy of a free people.

And this last word: The movement will never get fairly started if its leaders waste time bickering and debating over plans. They cannot dispel a fog by creating their own fog of dissension and indecision. But if they can gain acceptance by the public and by the Congress of the objectives and the principle of a coordinated and directed economy, a plan that is sound and practicable will be evolved through the time-tested legislative processes of democracy. W. JETT LAUCK

The Swaggering Gait

Bareheaded
the hair blond in tight curls
the heavy and worn

blue sweater
buttoned tight
under a cold sky

he walks
and lifts the butt of cigar
he holds

to his pursing lips
alone—
save for the tilt

of his shoulders
the swing of his knees—
Even the paper

lunch bag in his other hand
sharing
that one distinction

Fourth of July

FELLOW CITIZENS: On this Fourth of July all records for oratory will be broken, both as to quantity and pressure per square inch. The odd thing about it is that this year the old rhetorical flourishes will have suddenly come alive. The worse the rest of the world gets, the more attractive America all at once appears to the Americans. Pardon me while I add my two cents' worth to the verbal flood, if that child with the firecrackers will please move away out of earshot.

Looking back over a third of a century, it takes my breath away to see how the climate of opinion in regard to many matters has changed. I can recall when a proposal for the direct election of Senators threw the Tories into hysterics. As for a federal income tax, it was sheer anarchism and socialism, simultaneously—these being the great smear-words of the first two decades of the century. Women were an inferior kind of animal who would ruin the country at once if we were reckless enough to permit them to vote.

For about twenty-five years, I saw the progressives work with the grim shadow of the Supreme Court over their shoulders. They knew that every desirable measure that was passed would be tossed out, "Holmes and Brandeis dissenting." During most of this time, the overwhelming majority of the people felt that if a man was out of work it was certainly because he was lazy or a drunkard. When he arrived at old age without means to take care of himself, it was the result of improvidence. His children could support him, and serve them all jolly well right, or he and his wife could go and live separately in dormitories at the county poor farm. As for unions, the country wanted only a few of them, and those meek and timid.

During the first third of my active life, many good men and women who might have been more usefully engaged spent most of their time and energy trying to bring about the prohibition of alcoholic liquor. They were convinced that if this were done, crime and poverty would disappear overnight and the country would turn into a paradise with pink ribbons on it.

The waste of national resources was going on apace, and not one man in a thousand took it at all seriously. The country looked on approvingly as Mississippi Valley farmers mined the fertility out of the soil and suitcase ranchers, farther West, built a whole system of life on breaking the plains for crops that were possible only in the wet-weather cycle.

In those days a man's home may or may not have been his castle, but a business man's business certainly was. His relations with his employees were strictly his own affair; if he happened to be mean and tight-fisted, as many times he was, his workers took it in silence or moved on somewhere else when they had a chance.

whatever crops he chose, and if he wanted to use bad and destructive methods, that was certainly his privilege.

Looking back from this Fourth of July, glorious or not according to your point of view, we see that every one of these attitudes of mind has disappeared or is on the way out. Nobody suggests that we should return to having Senators elected by state legislatures, or should abolish the income tax or restrict the ballot to men. The community has accepted the responsibility for those who are unemployed or need assistance in old age, and unionism has made great advances. The freedom of the business man has been curtailed in many directions, only a few of which he protests. We now at last have a Supreme Court that is willing to move forward with our changing civilization, and there is reason to believe it will retain its present character for decades to come. The prohibition experiment is over. We are making a beginning, however small, at sweeping away the slums.

The Tories keep on fighting but not very consistently. While they stick fairly well to their central principle of special privilege for themselves, as to details they conduct the struggle from a base line that continually advances (except when the progressives themselves give up temporarily, as they seemed to do during the twenties). In 1919, the conservatives were prepared to agree to the proposals of 1909; but as for those of 1919—they would die first! Today, they have got about as far as 1929. Their chief effort is to have us return to that time, on the assumption that this is both possible and desirable. From my point of view this would be a calamity not only as to the larger aspects of progress, noted above, but as to many smaller things. Except among the unemployed and those who are just on the danger line, life in America has improved in many particulars in the past decade. Some of this improvement is actually traceable to the great depression, and the rest to the fact that, believe it or not, we do get more sensible about certain matters as time passes.

In these ten years Americans have learned to play. The country has gone sport crazy, which seems to me an excellent thing. Golf and tennis are no longer rich men's games, and through the aid of a government whose paternalism in this case everyone accepts, hunting and fishing are still good and seem likely to remain so, despite the Cassandra predictions of the estimable J. N. Darling. Americans are copying one of the best aspects of British country life, and our whole population is going in for athletic exercises. An important reason for increased recreation is of course that shorter hours of work have given more time to play.

The curse of the nineteen-twenties was "keeping up with the Joneses," and the depression has done much to knock that idea on the head. People who get around more than I do tell me that many members of the middle class are finding unexpected

comparative poverty. They use night clubs less and the living-room at home a great deal more. The tremendous wave of enthusiasm for gardening that is now sweeping across the country can be attributed partly to this situation. I even hear of young matrons who, forced to do their own cooking, have discovered that they like it and that it is possible to set a far higher standard of culinary art. In general, we are eating and drinking with a moderation unparalleled in the past. Our dress is more sensible, especially that of women, and is getting still better.

Twenty years ago, Europeans visiting America were shocked at the unsightliness of our roads, with their borders of weeds and billboards. Today, the magnificent parkways that are beginning to stretch out from all our cities, under the example of New York, cause universal envy. When an expert delegation of planners from the Soviet Union came to America some time ago the thing that impressed them most was Jones Beach,

the creation of the indefatigable and miraculous Mr. Robert Moses. The people's playgrounds that are now flowering all over the country have been created or greatly helped, in multitudes of cases, by government agencies—the CCC, the WPA, the PWA and others. Even the older National Park Service has managed in recent years to attract vast numbers of Americans to the great playgrounds of the West. While the Nazis have been going indoors and pulling down the blinds, our civilization has moved out into the sunshine.

To be sure, all this is only one side of the ledger. There is a darker side as well; there are clouds on the horizon which threaten not only recent progress but all the values in life we hold most dear. But an oration on the national birthday is not the time for gloom. It is enough that we here in America should say again on this Fourth of July as we have said on so many others, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. And the amazing thing is, it's true.

BRUCE BLIVEN

Jews of No Man's Land

We, stripped in this unmerciful year,
naked to the front and end of it, to the blast
two ways from the future and the past,
we despoiled of our houses; sold to the sky; here

Poland to the right and to the left
Sudetenland; snarled at by two frontiers; Jew
Jewess and Jew-baby; the blue
sky for our cover patched by gasoline tins; bereft

of the decent pillow and the mouth to mouth
in a good bed, in a tight house, the rain locked outside;
bearing our children under the thistle-stalk; dried
by weather; gnawed by the wind's mouth;

bearing our children in the dry ditch, between the
winter's

slide of ice upon us and the autumn's rain;
wearing our good days tattered on our skin
in the shape of old clothes; given to the hunter's

shot and bullet, fair game in a dry meadow,
foodless, without bread, without body, we Jews
houseless, tongueless, without value, without use;
we are here; remember us; we dwindle to shadow,

we break our teeth on the hard winter; ghost
is our substance and the flesh of our hands; water
is the meaning of our words. Our tongues are bitter.
Our words run like melting ice. Our speech is dust.

You who pity us, you who are troubled by our names,

comfort held closely inside your hand,
you who look at us out of the warm rooms;

hold hard to your good thing that you may not lose it!
Thus and thus it was with us; the same bread,
white and smelling warm; the bed
such as you have it and the ceiling above it;

lest the same come upon you in another country,
under another side of the sky, and you
fall useless into this nothing, and you
shiver naked peeled of your plenty,

learn how desolation was made for us!
Now we sit unhoused upon the ground,
our backs bent for warmth; the land
empty and the emptiness of sky over us;

daily we ask the question; is it bright,
is the gold face of the sun upon it, will it smile,
will it be kind and naked upon us or do we feel,
clouding the light and multiplying the light,

the round drop of rain that we have no room for
in our flesh worn and sweetened with rain;
will we have rain to eat; upon our chin
the dribble of the rain running over?

Learn how we were brought to this desolation,
how we were betrayed by our sleep and our
pleasant customs and peace and by the striking hour
lest it be done to each of you in your nation!

Shoot the Works

What's the Rush?

EDITORS are always aggrieved if any field hand turns in his copy just a little late. Either by epithet, gentle rebuke or the mere lifting of an eyebrow the erring author is made to feel that he is guilty of a sin. This breaks down his morale and as he slinks away after being lashed for laziness he may even begin to believe that he is indolent. And if he holds the thought, there is the danger he may in actuality become shiftless and unreliable.

Of course the truth is that last-minute copy is the best copy. Pieces written slowly and laboriously and mailed in on the dot are generally as tedious as a letter from Ferdinand Lundberg, the tired bull of the pampered. Somebody should take that red herring out of Ferdinand's nose and replace it with a ring, for his polemics clearly prove that he is fit to be tied. Mr. Lundberg is a curious assayer who thinks that men like Morrie Ryskind and Ben Stolberg are liberals. Among the flock which constitutes his committee are those who have done their best to split every union from the Auto Workers to the Newspaper Guild.

This is said merely in passing. It would be folly to devote much space or energy to Ferdinand. Great Goliath was wiped out with a single pebble and Lundberg is no more than a mark for some boy with a bean shooter.

But, as I was saying, what one is assigned to do today should always be put off until tomorrow. Only the cynical can contend that the present is ever as bright as the future. The piece which was promised for a Wednesday morning at ten will be all the better if kept in some moist cool place and delivered on a Saturday. Of course I will be told that if manuscripts do not come in on time the magazine itself may be late in issuance. And that is supposed to be a knock-down and drag-out argument. But why should magazines run on time like Mussolini's trains? Their exactitude of schedule puts the mark of premeditation upon them. Indeed the rigors of planned production even bring about the overtones of regimentation.

As I remember, The Saturday Evening Post was founded by Benjamin Franklin and comes out on Thursday. I am decidedly curious to know whether Poor Richard was two days early or five days behind his announced evening of issue. Respecting the wisdom of Mr. Franklin, I choose to assume the latter. In addition to discovering electricity he also found the virtues of certain mental flashes which travel at a speed much inferior to that of lightning. And so he hit upon the novel idea of founding a paper and fooling his public by having it appear precisely five days after its deadline. I imagine that he hoped his shrewd device would give his little journal of opinion the blessed quality of being belated forever and forever. But though he was a man of vision Franklin could see the future only dimly through the darkened glass. If he walks the streets of Philadelphia invisible he must be surprised to note what they have done to his dream child.

In the long ago he could hardly have been expected to know that the

front-page cover in color of a barefoot boy catching a big fish with a bent pin in the old swimming hole. And in the original prospectus there was no mention of the fact that sooner or later Ray Moley would tell all about how he formed the brain trust and why it bit him. Even more would the brow of Dr. Franklin be furrowed if he saw a preliminary advertisement announcing, "He was Princeton's finest forward passer and she was the glamor debbie of the season. Fate cast these two alone on a desert island in the Pacific. What happened? Complete in the next issue. Read 'Hold That Tiger.'"

And speaking of college athletics, I would like to digress if only for a sentence. It seems to me that Ferdinand Lundberg himself is a three-letter man and I will award a chocolate mouse to any reader who can supply the missing letters. But to get back to Franklin again, I feel that his original plan of publishing a magazine which should always be five days late has failed. Naturally I mean in the spiritual sense only. To all intents and purposes The Post has become a Thursday publication. A friend of mine sets his calendar by it. Paradoxically enough, the whole nation would now be shaken if The Post came out unexpectedly on a Saturday. And I am suggesting that it would be an excellent idea. The nation should be shaken and so should The Saturday Evening Post.

The New Republic also comes out on Thursday except along Hunting Ridge where I live. Our local dealer generally forgets to provide himself with his copy until along about Monday or Tuesday. Perhaps he peruses it himself before he places it on sale and I have often wondered what he buys one-half so precious as the stuff he sells. It so happens that I am the local dealer's customer for The New Republic and I think that my reaction in getting it belatedly serves to prove my point. Once I used to make a special trip into New York on Wednesday in order to get a preview. A freshly butchered copy of the magazine was not without interest, but occasionally I found it necessary to call for a steel knife in order to cut through articles by some of the other contributors. Naturally I had no trouble at all in taking Broun with a spoon. But now I go to the local news dealer and get my New Republic after it has been hanging for two or three days. It is much more tender. In fact all the recent issues have been as sweet as a Nutmeg.

And so I am inclined to make two proposals, one even more daring than the other. My first suggestion is that when an entire week goes by and Broun has no ideas whatsoever he should call up the home office and make that fact known to the authorities. Naturally he should break the news tactfully and run no risk of producing shock at either end of the line. In course of time there would be no necessity of making any great to-do about the contributing editor's lack of fertility. Instead of having the standing head "Shoot the Works" another slug should be inserted reading, "No dice today."

But now hold your hats. Here is the revolutionary proposal. It is also touched with fantasy. I further suggest that in the event of a week in which no editor of The New Republic has an idea there should not be any New Republic and that it appear a whole week late. And if you don't believe that promptness is a dangerous thing I can only cite the fact that this piece was turned in precisely

Washington Notes

Getting the Money Out

EVEN AMONG White House intimates, there is a difference of attitude toward Mr. Roosevelt's new spending program of nearly four billions. A group of officials, especially in the RFC and Treasury, feel that the administration has been pushed into it. Because of this group's faint-heartedness, Mr. Roosevelt has delayed until now in submitting his program to Congress. These officials hoped that private business might pick up of its own accord. They insisted that at least the voters should be convinced that business had been given every chance. As a result, the bill is late. There is danger that it will be squeezed by the clearly impending filibuster next month over the neutrality measure. If the spending bill is to be put through before adjournment, Mr. Roosevelt may be forced to make wide concessions.

The new program has only one merit that this group of officials will admit. This lies in the sobering fact that the 1938 PWA program will shortly reach its peak, probably in July, and thereafter rapidly tail off. The New Deal cannot drift into the 1940 campaign without an effort to increase jobs and payrolls. It cannot risk a sharp, sudden slump in heavy construction just about the time that state convention slates are being drawn up.

A second faction of White House advisers, made up of Federal Reserve, SEC and Labor Department officials, likewise has an eye to the elections. Chiefly, however, it looks on the new program as the most exact, intelligent, scientific planning the New Deal has done. It will be the first time any government, anywhere, has tried what might be called selective pump-priming. Beside it, earlier PWA programs are as a bow and arrow to a tommy-gun. They explain that pump-priming was given prestige, if not invented, by Mr. J. M. Keynes, and that Mr. Keynes was primarily concerned with social controls for the volume of a nation's money. He was interested in seeing to it that, in times of depression, the volume of money was maintained by government spending; he was only mildly interested in what the money went for. Back in 1934-35, Mr. Keynes's influence among New Dealers was enormous, and the first New Deal spending programs had the simple slogan: "Get the money out—fast."

Since then, the selective spenders say, this country has conducted a series of vast experiments. Despite New Deal blundering, these experiments are closer to social planning than anything previously attempted. At least from a technical standpoint, they surpass what has been done in Soviet Russia, which did not have to face the problems of a relatively mature industrial system. By these experiments, it has been established that a governmental pump-priming dollar "works" perhaps twenty times harder in a depressed industry than in one that is not depressed.

This doctrine was first stated by the housing enthusiasts. With what we now can see was excessive enthusiasm, they said: "Restart the housing industry, and you will put a

four or five years of prosperity." The selective pump-primers are moderately satisfied with the progress of the housing program. Many hundred thousand slum families are still ill housed, but activity within the industry has reached a point where building-supply prices are not only firm, but tending to rise. New Deal economists, indeed, think they are moving upwards too easily, and both Assistant Attorney General Arnold and the TNEC suspect monopolistic agreements. TNEC hearings on building-supply prices are scheduled to be held soon.

From the economist's point of view, the armament appropriations of the present session are also selective pump-priming. The aviation companies have been primed with too liberal a hand; they are already operating at near to capacity, and the government's money is likely to go into profits, not increased activity. Much the same thing is true of the shipbuilding companies, wallowing in orders from both the navy and the United States Maritime Commission. But some of this money will splash over into the machine-tool industry, a pump that the New Dealers are eager to start functioning.

The two sickest industries, in the New Dealers' opinion, are those making equipment for the railroads and the power companies. These are the two they want most to prime. The railroad bill, designed to give the roads a respite from bonded indebtedness and permit them to buy equipment with their own earnings, seems lost at the present session, although the Chandler bill, chiefly for the benefit of Uncle Dan Willard of the Baltimore and Ohio, may squeak through. Mr. Roosevelt's new plans include the scheme originally worked out by Mr. Justice Douglas, when he was SEC chairman, by which the government would buy equipment and lease it to the railroads. Whether this scheme will obtain congressional approval is doubtful. It is reported to have the grim opposition of Mr. Jesse Jones, whose RFC has specialized in railroad-equipment loans. The New Dealers would like to lend money to the power companies, but deeply distrust the present company managements. The May bill, setting rigid limits to the TVA, seems to most New Dealers a final proof of the congenital treachery of the utility chieftains. Nevertheless, the New Deal plan for government loans to the utilities in the name of national defense has again been put forward.

As these Notes are written, the WPA appropriation bill is before the Senate, and it is possible that some of the mutilations inflicted by the House may be healed. The New Deal high command, however, should not escape blame. No other administration measure of equal importance has been so weakly defended. There is no plausible reason why the WPA could not have been saved intact, just as it now seems likely that the National Labor Relations Board will be saved. Lamentable or not, the WPA has been knee-deep in politics since it was established. After last summer's attempted purge, it was clear that the WPA would be the object of wild attack at the present session. When Mr. Roosevelt decided to remove two top New Dealers, Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Aubrey Williams, common prudence should have warned him to put equally gifted men in their places. Colonel "Pinky" Harrington, who succeeded Mr. Hopkins, is estimable of character and administratively able.

strangers; he has no following whatever in Congress. When Mr. Woodrum tried to reduce Mr. Williams' Youth Administration, no less than forty-eight House members spontaneously spoke in its defense. Colonel Harrington's chief supporter turned out to be Mr. Woodrum himself, who, in appreciation of Colonel Harrington's precise and dignified testimony, publicly urged that he be made one of the proposed three-men WPA administrative board. In the House, at least, the WPA appropriation was unaccountably mishandled by the administration.

Washington

T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Timetrust, Inc.

THE EDITOR OF THE NEW REPUBLIC has just received from Timetrust, Inc., what I call a "You-lie-it-was-a-coat" letter. You may recall that Jacques in "The Two Orphans" was accused of stealing a cloak, to which he replied indignantly: "You lie; it was a coat." And Jacques thought this a complete defense. No one, of course, has accused Timetrust, Inc. of stealing a cloak or anything else. But I did report certain criticisms of this institution which were made by the SEC. Timetrust, Inc., now writes a letter to The New Republic which reveals that it is quite well pleased with itself if it can point to some such minor discrepancy as salved the conscience of Jacques.

The substance of what I wrote about Timetrust, Inc., was briefly: that it was a sort of special-fund type of investment trust; that the SEC had charged that it was selling its certificates under a misrepresentation, by speaking of investments in its certificates as comparable to a savings bank. I pointed out that the investor who buys certificates to the amount of \$1,200 would have so much deducted each month from his monthly payments that at the end of eighteen months he would have paid in \$180 but would have to his credit only \$88.20. I reported that the SEC also charged that Timetrust, Inc., was part of the plan of the Transamerica Corporation to create a busy market for Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association shares.

In replying to this, the president of Timetrust, Inc., in his letter undertakes to demolish these statements by pointing out what he calls certain inaccuracies. Of course, the substance of my article is the important thing. But let us look at the inaccuracies.

1. Timetrust, Inc., says I am wrong in referring to it as a form of investment trust, because it is a plan for investing in a single security in which the interests of one investor are in no way intertwined with those of another.

I said it was a form of investment trust of the type generally known as a special fund. That is absolutely true. It is not necessary for an investment trust to invest in more than one security or for the interests of the investors to be intertwined. Of course a good investment trust will diversify its stocks. That is why this is not a good investment trust. It is the special-fund type which is inherently bad. I added that it was a speculation pure and simple. That point is ignored

these words: "By intermingling the investment funds of many people, Timetrust seeks to obtain for small amounts the growth and earning power of a large fund."

2 and 3. I described the Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association as a holding company which owns Bank of America, which owns 400 branches in California. This is one of the "you-lie-it-is-a-coat" points. Timetrust, Inc., says that Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association is not a holding company owning Bank of America but that it is the Bank of America. Will someone explain to me how this affects the article I printed?

4. I said Timetrust, Inc., had in its control all the shares of the Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association which are bought by it for its customers. This is called an inaccuracy. The SEC states in its complaint: "All shares of bank stock acquired by the trustee for the accounts of the 'trustors' are issued in the name of the trustee. Pursuant to the trust agreement it has intermingled and is now intermingling all shares of bank stock in the trustors' accounts." The trustee is an insurance and guaranty company which is also a subsidiary of Transamerica Corporation. And in the trust agreement the trustor—the investor—delegates to Timetrust, Inc., the right to determine the manner in which the shares purchased shall be voted. Does this amount to control? Or does Timetrust, Inc., think readers of this magazine are zanies?

5. I said that at the end of eighteen months a subscriber to two certificates of the value of \$1,200 would have paid in \$180 but would have only \$88.20 to his credit. This is called an error. Timetrust says that what the subscriber has to his credit is not money at all but the number and fraction of shares purchased for his account. That, alas, is true. But the amount of his payments that would have been credited to his account would be as I have described it—\$88.20. My statement was absolutely correct. Of course the money is invested in a speculative venture in a single stock. And I pointed out that fact, adding that the only chance for the investor to get his \$180 back would be for the shares purchased to increase in price sufficiently to cover all the fees which had been deducted.

6. Timetrust, Inc., quarrels with my statement that payments are collected at the branch banks of the concern. Timetrust, Inc., says the bank does not make "collections," but that the investor "may make payments at any branch of the bank for transmittal instead of to the trustee direct." Well, when you make a payment to a collector, do you not make them "for transmittal" to the person entitled to receive them? The SEC, however, says this is done "pursuant to an arrangement made by Timetrust, Inc., with the defendant Bank of America, etc." It goes further. Trustors are asked to execute authorization cards empowering the banks to deduct the payment each month from the investor's bank account and send it to Timetrust, Inc. Once more, does the president of Timetrust think the readers of this magazine are zanies?

7. "Mr. Flynn," says Timetrust, Inc., "observed with evident satisfaction, that Timetrust, Inc. . . . finds itself in that rather unsavory position . . . of representing at the same time, the distributor and the investor." Timetrust, Inc., says it does not buy shares for investors. They are purchased in the open market. The SEC . . .

Association shares. It is also a buyer of them for investors. That is two sides of the market. But the SEC complaint goes much further than this. It says: "Timetrust, Inc., has been and now is selling said bank stock and is acting as a dealer for profit in the purchase and sale of said stock. Among other transactions in said bank stock, *Timetrust, Inc., purporting to act as a dealer, has sold at a profit, shares of bank stock to the trustee, purchasing for 'trustors'.*"

8. Timetrust, Inc., says that Flynn, trusting to a faulty memory, said the RFC had to come to the aid of this holding company back in 1931 to the tune of a hundred million. I did trust to my memory on the date. Actually the RFC loans to Giannini's adventures, including the Bank of America, began February 15, 1932. What point is involved in whether the loans seven years ago were made six weeks earlier or later? This is the "you-lie-it-was-a-coat" approach again. Timetrust, Inc., says these loans reached their peak in June, when they were \$52,799,000. I saw the records of the RFC's secret report which put them at \$65,000,000 in the summer or fall of 1932. And the total of loans to Transamerica, which is the holding company I was referring to in this connection, through various devices, amounted to \$100,000,000. Timetrust, Inc., is just wrong. But what difference, as to the point I am making, whether it was a fifty-two-million-dollar cloak or a hundred-million-dollar coat? The point was that the government had to come to its rescue to the tune of millions.

The final point is on the allegation of the SEC that Timetrust, Inc., compared its investment to a savings-bank investment. Timetrust, Inc., denies it has done this. The SEC says that it has. On this point I merely reported the complaint of the SEC. My report was absolutely accurate.

But the SEC is investigating the whole Giannini outfit including Timetrust, Inc., and there will be a full investigation, doubtless, of all these points. The public will get the facts, beyond a doubt, in time.

JOHN T. FLYNN

Breathing Spell

WHAT WITH the theatre and all, I have been out of control when some of the worthy pictures that are still bobbing around through Cue were first released. I missed "The Hound of the Baskervilles" by a few hundred miles, for example. I have always missed the hound, having been busy with Young and Old King Brady and The Dare Boys at an age when everybody else was taking this on. But by pure coincidence I came across it in a ship's library last winter, and read it at last. My impression was that I should have got to it earlier if I was going to get it at all.

As you probably know by this time, they got their effects with Basil Rathbone, Nigel Bruce and a dog the size of a colt. Also pretty realistic moor scenery, mist and rocks, etc. Where the story wouldn't fit into pictures they changed it, but otherwise they kept soberly to the business of the novel, clearing away its ornate impassages of writing and succeeding marvelously in making real characters of both Holmes and Watson. I thought the hound should have been heard from more, and I suppose the SPCA kept them from setting him on fire with turpentine to get a terrifying silhouette in the dark. I don't imagine anybody's

it is a self-respecting job and as good an excuse as any to spend an air-cooled hour or so one of these evenings.

I was sorry to miss up on "Man of Conquest," too. Its story of Sam Houston and the grabbing off of Texas is perhaps less prettied up than is true of the run of screen epics, but its importance to the trade is that it was made by one of the "small" companies. Republic is of course getting larger, but there is always the dazzling hope that some day some outfit too small to tremble with such mighty fears as shake Metro will take a subject that is not good movie taste, and do it up brown. "Man of Conquest" is done brown enough—it scandalizes history with the best of them.

"Dark Victory" is another film that I neglected to report, and shouldn't have (week before this it played eighteen houses in Manhattan alone). Looking back over the course of the last five years I realize suddenly one reason may have been that a picture like this is not news any more. I don't mean that a finely rounded job of film making isn't important in any season, especially the present; it's simply that we have come naturally to expect, when a movie is good, that it will be good all the way; made with and by the right people, it stands complete in itself, and fumbles with its cap before no other art whatever. "Dark Victory" is the my-days-are-numbered type of story, this time operative on an impetuous young thing who learns responsibility, and true love, too, through an affliction of brain and eyesight. And Bette Davis is the very genius of the screen. You might say that Miss Davis was restricted in range in that she couldn't play Katharine Cornell, but by me that would prove only that there is a happy freedom to be gained in restriction: in her capacity she is not equaled by anyone, and in developing this special capacity—always the suggestion of almost evil and certainly unhealthy subsurfaces—she has achieved results in general intensity that are exceeded by few. "Dark Victory" as a play ran in one theatre on Broadway; as a picture it is running out over the world like quicksilver, for all people to see and to some extent adjust their expectations of art by. I said eighteen houses in Manhattan alone. I said in one week.

To get up closer to the day's work, there is a film that has just left the first run in New York, "Clouds Over Europe." It's a picture all right: it is printed on celluloid and moves before your eyes and people talk just like real and everything. In its story, which it takes seriously, it seems that some Teutonic cheps are up to no good with reference to a new super-charger developed for the exclusive use of some English cheps in the flying service. The trial-flight planes are brought down at sea by a powerful ray with annoying efficiency, and since no one thinks to lay a course anywhere but directly across the death-ray ship, the process would be going on yet if it hadn't been for Ralph Richardson—who is a swell enough actor to be the life of any party—and a young lovely whose veteran skill in scooping all other reporters of any sex has given her a certain nose for the deepest intrigue of nations and a charming manner of coming to the point: "Oh look here, you know, a jubb's a jubb." Aided by these two, and a unit of His Majesty's fleet, Laurence Olivier is finally able to keep the super-charger, the girl and the jubb too.

The film was made (by Columbia) in England, where there is a general lack of the technique for smoothing over

a fast-action formula to hang character and comedy on, in addition to every ounce of suspense the traffic will bear, these people have used a Hollywood-Hitchcock formula to hang themselves on. They see perfectly that there should be a laugh here, a bucket of blood there, and then get so anxious to telephone you that there it is, it's coming down the track, that they miss the train altogether. They are learning though, and there are a few laughs and thrills in the picture. I prefer going to "The Lady Vanishes" (Hitchcock) for the second time, and "I Met Him in Paris" (Wesley Ruggles) for the third. The world is so full of a number of things that I see no more reason why you should get the latest movie smell up your nose than you should abstain from reading a good book in a weak publishing season. The movies are always wonderful, but don't say I sent you.

OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

Wars are caused by idleness. I think our new tractor will do a lot to outlaw war. How? By keeping people busy. — *Henry Ford, quoted on page 3 of The New York Times.*

The Ford Motor Company, Ltd., has reached an agreement with the British government whereby it will lay in an extra supply of Fordson tractors as part of a possible war-time reserve. — *News item on page 7 of the same issue.*

When asked by the ministers for his definition of a Communist, Mr. Myer [Houston City Attorney] replied that he thought of one as a "low creature with no respect for God, who does not believe in law, and who is a cross between an anarchist and a fox." — *From The Houston, Texas, Post.*

WANT INVESTOR WITH \$10,000 TO JOIN us in organizing an armament corporation; have large inventory; possible profits tremendous; indications awfully good. — *From the classified advertising department of The New York Times.*

Is Everybody Happy?

Laborers have formed a Trades and Labor Union. The new organization has the good will of both the government and the employers. — *From an article on the Islands of Barbadoes in The Crown Colonist.*

Just Filth, Filth, Filth All Summer Long

Sally Rand, who had been arrested in Chicago in 1933 for her fan dance, came to the defense of Mayor Kelly.

"Mayor Kelly is right," she said. "The play ["Tobacco Road"] sickened me with its filth when I first saw it and it has continued to sicken me every time I have seen it since then." — *From an A. P. feature story by Mark Barron in The Louisville Courier-Journal.*

Where Did You Come From, Baby Dear?

The Fortels have one other child, Marvin, five. He was not predetermined. — *From a story in The New York Post about Sidney A. Fortel, who has developed a "secret formula" for predetermining the sex of babies.*

Unalterable and Inalienable

Gas masks which the government has ordered for 1,400,000 babies were designed on the theory that every baby has the right to suck its thumb. — *A. P. dispatch from London in The St. Petersburg, Fla., Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and \$1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Military Alliances in Europe

SIR: Will you permit a mere layman to point out the joker in Major Eliot's detailed analysis of European military strategy—"If War Breaks Out Tomorrow" [The New Republic, May 24]? In his impressive tables of comparative armaments, the Major lines up Germany, Italy, Hungary and Spain against France, Britain, Poland, Rumania, Turkey, Greece and Egypt, and shows his mastery of arithmetic by adding up the totals of divisions, planes and ships without a single error. There is only one discrepancy in his neat tables. He has left out the Soviet Union, with the largest army and the largest air force in the world. True, Major Eliot parenthetically touches on the possibility of Soviet "intervention." But having made this perfunctory bow in the direction of the Soviet Union, he goes on blithely adding his columns of figures and speculating on the course of a war between the Axis powers and the Anglo-French bloc *without* Russia.

Now, no one questions that there are ample grounds for wondering whether the Anglo-Soviet military alliance will ever be consummated. But that depends entirely upon whether the British government will choose to revert to the Chamberlain appeasement policy—in which case there will be no war—or will decide to resist the Fascist Axis. After Munich no one can prophesy what the British ruling class is capable of. *But if Britain does decide to fight any further Fascist aggression*, no sober student of international affairs can for a moment imagine that she will consider risking a war against the Axis without a Soviet alliance. Nor will France or Poland or Rumania or Turkey. Hence the Major's tables and the military speculations which he bases on them turn out to be exercises in addition which belong to the realm of pure arithmetic (If I have four apples!) and not to the realistic appraisals of political alignments upon which military potentials are based. He might as well be discussing a war between Bolivia and Switzerland.

New York City

ALTER BRODY

SIR: As I stated in the beginning of my article, unless one makes certain assumptions in a discussion of European military conditions, one wanders aimlessly from vague possibility to vaguer conjecture. I therefore made, and clearly stated, the assumption upon which I was writing. Mr. Brody prefers another set of assumptions, *i.e.*, that the initiative for war rests entirely in British hands, and that Britain and her associates will not fight unless assured of Russian support. Mr. Brody is, of course, entitled to this assumption if it pleases him better than mine; but I think it entirely fair to point out that the intentions of the Kremlin have not so far been made very plain, and that the Soviet Union is certainly, to date, committed to no support of British policy.

Mr. Brody makes the common error of appraising Soviet military power as overwhelming. All such comparisons are relative, and have to do with geographical and other factors. Informed sources do not seem certain that the Soviet air force is larger than the German, nor so efficient as any of the other large European air forces. As to the Red Army, it is assuredly large but its military efficiency in an offensive war in Central Europe is open to the gravest doubts. If it remains purely on the defensive, of course, it can hardly hope to do much to stop German attacks on Poland and/or Rumania. Nor have these latter powers displayed any remarkable enthusiasm for admitting Soviet troops to their territories.

With these various factors in mind, therefore, one is faced with a complex situation in which one can only pick and choose a basis upon which to try to give one's readers some comparative data of value. In doing so, if one rejects the theory of the "invincible Russian steam-roller" (so hearteningly spoken of in London and Paris in the late summer of 1914) at least one is not without historical basis for one's doubts.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

Why Gedye Used "Anonymous Sources"

SIR: In a review of my "Betrayal in Central Europe" in *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, the comment is made that "experts might demur to the occasional use of anonymous sources for authoritative information." As I have pointed out in additional chapters about to be published in a new edition of my book, I do not think that experts who have any acquaintance with the Nazi system of terror would advance such criticism. In the case of my Austrian chapters, to reveal sources might have cost the lives of a number of persons formerly of high position who are now prisoners of the Nazis and the liberties of others who have so far escaped attention. In the case of Czecho-Slovak chapters, all my precautions seem to have been insufficient, as I learned in New York of the arrest of one prominent Czecho-Slovak by the Germans in connection with information appearing in my book, although in point of fact he was not even known to me.

Elsewhere I have been challenged specifically concerning my account of the fateful interview between Schuschnigg and Hitler at Berchtesgaden, and critics have asked how I could possibly have learned of what passed at this very private interview between the two statesmen. There again is a question which obviously I must not answer. But it should not be difficult to imagine quite a number of explanations.

London, England

G. E. R. GEDYE

Japan and the Neutrality Act

SIR: In a letter in your issue of May 31, I pointed out that the Thomas amendment to the Neutrality Act would make it possible for the first time to curb Japan's war party without cutting off the help we have been giving China. I also questioned your editorial opinion that invocation of the present Neutrality Act would damage Japan more than China. In commenting on my letter, you referred to a study by the Institute of Pacific Relations as supporting that opinion.

Mr. William W. Lockwood Jr., of the staff of Institute, has written to me as follows:

"Your position with regard to applying the Neutrality Act was altogether correct, and the use which *The New Republic* made of the IPR bulletin—presumably an article of mine in *The Far Eastern Survey*, dated September 15, 1937—hardly warranted.

diate effect of the applying Act as then constituted. It was necessarily speculative in character, as was made clear. On the point in question I reached the conclusion that applying the Act would probably injure Japan more than China, but only on the assumption that in a protracted war Japan would and could completely blockade China. In fact, such a tight blockade has failed to materialize. In any case, it will hardly do to cite a study prepared in September, 1937, in support of an argument in the spring of 1939."

I wonder if most of your readers are as fully committed to an isolationist position as you appear to be. Your contributors do seem to be unwilling to back up England on the European continent, but in your questionnaire you hardly encouraged any expression of opinion about the Far East. If your contributors and readers are at all like the masses on whose opinions the Gallup Poll has recently reported, they ought willingly to support peaceful measures to curb Japan.

As you have pointed out, it is not necessary to depend upon general revision of the Neutrality Act to get an embargo on Japan. In fact, Senator Pittman's new resolution (S. J., Res. 123) deals directly with such an embargo. I hope it is not too late for *The New Republic* to throw its own weight behind this measure.

New York City

A. B. HERSEY

Carskadon vs. Ferguson

SIR: Much as it pains me to disagree with my former trenchmate Otis Ferguson, I think some record should be made of the fact that there exists a contrary opinion to his estimate of the documentary film, "The City" [*The New Republic*, June 14].

There are many spectators who found Lewis Mumford's commentary sharp and inspiring and regarded Aaron Copland's score as among his abler jobs. The film has brought much and deserved acclaim to its director-cameramen, Ralph Steiner and Willard Van Dyke. Their newly launched American Documentary Films is looked upon as a likely rallying point for a genuine documentary film movement in this country.

I have a sidewise suspicion that Otis' valued and astringent personal crusade as Urban Anti-Christ to the "I just LOVE the country" school of pseudo-agrarians from Sheridan Square may have blinded him to the real merits of "The City." It did say (very wittily, I thought) that the contemporary city is a louse; that life is better when garnished with a little sky and sun; and there are quite a number of us—professional critics as well as run-of-the-aisle viewers—who think the film as a whole is superb.

New York City

T. R. CARSKADON

[Tommy you traitor, I saw you at the preview and whose guest were you?—get out in the open. I'm still your loyal trenchmouth, however, and of course it's a wonderful picture except that (confidentially, Tommy) it stinks. —O. F.]

More About Neutrality

SIR: In your editorial of June 21 on the congressional fight over the Neutrality Act you say "the opposition [to the administration's position, even by implication, as those who wish to take unnecessary chances of getting into war. Of course there are very few persons in this country who want it to get into

It is certainly unfair to classify the supporters of the administration's position, even by implication, as those who wish to take unnecessary chances of getting into war. Of course there are very few persons in this country who want it to get into

gress, as in the first case Chamberlain and Daladier will be given "a blank check," and in the second "Hitler and Mussolini will represent the result as support for them." You recommend that the administration withdraw from the fight for a time at least. Naturally, you mean by this that you favor the opposition, although you carefully avoid saying so, in an effort to strengthen your position by seeming impartial. If the administration should follow your advice, we should be unable to sell arms to England and France if they were attacked. Hitler and Mussolini would certainly represent this result also as support for them. And it seems to me that they would be quite right.

New York City

JAMES BENÉT

[Apparently Mr. Benét does favor giving Chamberlain and Daladier a blank check. The New Republic has several times stated its position that repeal of the arms embargo should be retained as a bargaining inducement to Britain and France to adopt aims and policies of which this country can approve. The intent of the editorial was not to seem impartial but to avoid both horns of a dilemma. Hitler and Mussolini would derive more comfort from defeat of the administration proposal than from mere continuance of the present situation without a vote on the issue. — THE EDITORS]

Ratner vs. Ayres

SIR: In the May 17 issue of *The New Republic*, Mr. C. E. Ayres reviews "Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy," which I edited. As far as I can gather from his review, Mr. Ayres had been reading a book entitled "The Wit and Wisdom of Schopenhauer" and it was this book, not "Intelligence in the Modern World," he thought he was reviewing.

But inadvertencies do happen, and in one short paragraph Mr. Ayres makes oblique reference to "Intelligence in the Modern World." He says Dewey's principle of the "continuity of inquiry" is "all omitted." Far from this being the case, it is "all included"—but, of course, where it belongs, namely, in Chapter XVI. Since Mr. Ayres is so concerned with this "principle," I cannot help wondering why he didn't use the book which is the ostensible occasion of his review to the extent of at least consulting the Index. In its limited way, it would have given him some of the easy help and guidance he obviously needs.

I also wonder by what clairvoyant power Mr. Ayres knows that nobody will "learn to think, Deweywise or otherwise, by a perusal of these passages." By the evidence of his review, Mr. Ayres certainly did not read the book. It is equally certain by virtue of the same evidence that he did not even take reasonable care to find out in a general way what the book contains, how it was built up, what principles of continuity and development controlled its systematic organization from start to finish.

Consequently, Mr. Ayres's exhibition of "social conscience" at the end of his piece strikes me as singularly unconvincing. He writes:

To nine-tenths of its readers "Intelligence in the Modern World" will bring genteel amusement, the illusion of intellectual sophistication. On their shelves, it will stand beside Schopenhauer. I shudder to think of it.

Before Mr. Ayres again publicly shudders at what *others* will do with a book, it might be well for him to do a little private shuddering at what *he* does when reviewing a book.

Through clairvoyance, Mr. Ayres may know the intellectual-moral quality of nine-tenths of the readers of *The New Republic*.

conclusive evidence I, for one, see no reason for believing that nine-tenths of them are and will be like himself.

New York City

JOSEPH RATNER

SIR: Dr. Ratner conveys the impression, whether intentionally or not, that the actual chapters, omission of which I deplored, are in fact included elsewhere in his anthology. Such is not the case. Chapter XVI consists of four selections, one from "Essays in Experimental Logic," one from "How We Think," one from "Experience and Nature" and one from "The Quest for Certainty." The chapter is entitled "Thinking and Meaning," and it does deal in a general way with what Dewey calls "the continuity of inquiry."

I should not care to rest a serious discussion on a phrase. But since Dr. Ratner suggests referring to his index, I note with interest that the phrase "continuity of inquiry" does not appear in the index, and that although there are several references under "continuity" and several more under "inquiry" none of either group refers to any passage in Chapter XVI.

No doubt Dr. Ratner feels that the passages he has reproduced in Chapter XVI and elsewhere from Dewey's earlier works do full justice to the ideas to the development of which the earlier chapters of "Logic: The Theory of Inquiry" were devoted. But I don't think so, and I judge that Dewey didn't when he wrote that book; otherwise why should he have done it all over again? Stated bluntly, the whole point to my review was that I prefer Dewey's books as Dewey wrote them, and I believe serious students will do so. The Modern Library quite legitimately and usefully appeals to another audience from which, I venture to hope, serious students will be recruited. That, evidently, isn't good enough for Dr. Ratner.

The University of Texas, Austin, Texas

C. E. AYRES

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Seward Brisbane of New York City, the son of the late Hearst columnist, comments on Barbara Wertheim's "We Saw Democracy Fail" (May 17). He suggests a key to the relationship between the "dissimilar minorities that rendered ineffectual our political democracy to express the will of the people. . . . Are they not all, either through direct interest or sociological conditioning, linked to the owners of the means of production, when not actually propertied? If this is so, does their success not bear out the theory that the owners of the means of production ultimately rule the state, regardless of the political rationale under which it appears to function?" Those don't look like the old man's footsteps.

G. M. Lanzillotti of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, has some reservations about the merit of Hollywood's new "social conscience." He reports a bus conversation he overheard: First Rider—"You ought to see that picture 'Confessions of a Nazi Spy.' It will make you see what is going on here. These Nazis should be stopped." Second Rider—"Yes, it is coming here." First Rider—"You know who does all these things, don't you? It's these dirty Germans, Jews, Greeks and Italian dagoes and wops! Remember that fellow who pushed me when we got on the bus? A Jew. You see the way they are here?" Second Rider—"Yes, it is coming here. It's inevitable."

Roland Stromberg of Kansas City, Missouri, is both "disappointed and surprised" that our series, "Books That Changed Our Minds," is not going to include an article on Charles H. Cooley's "Human Nature and Society." . . . M. Hart Walker of East Orange, New Jersey, says, about the editorial "Liberty and Common Sense" (May 31): ". . . it is sickening to find

Books in Review

The Man at the Wheel

IF YOU ARE THINKING of "Night Flight," you should be told that Saint Exupéry's new book on flying¹ is more turgid and jumbled, both larger in ambition and less complete in its effect. Under the general headings "The Craft," "The Men," "The Tool," "The Elements," he has gone back to the tangible experience of men, places, incidents and remembered sensations to show you not only the vivid picture itself but what its meaning is and how the gradual accumulation of meanings is gathered up for him into a philosophy.

The book has many things for many readers. I like best the parts about actual flying, his own experience, the experiences of Mermoz and Guillaumet and the others; the humdrum or exhilaration of the uneventful passage, the sudden menace—clouds, down-currents, the motors gone or bearings lost—and the terrifying days in the desert or the snow. Next to that, I like his sober talk of a new world, which is partly riding the wild currents of the air, partly in seeing the old world from this perspective. I find less interest in his chapter on desert life, and in the later sections given over to pure theory. For one thing, he has made his point already. For another, he is more apt to give rein to a tendency that is observable even when he is sticking to business, an overboard kind of fancy rhapsody: "I was still wrapped in the aura of friendship . . . expectant of surprise and palpitatingly prepared for happiness [Lewis Galantière's otherwise fine job of translation is caught napping here]; and yet already I was soaked in spray; a mail pilot, I was already nibbling the bitter pulp of night flight."

On the surface of it he is introducing us to a new craft. He has an appreciation for the growing symmetry of the modern airship: "Perfection is finally attained not when there is no longer anything to add, but when there is no longer anything to take away." And he has a fine scorn for all the rhetorical head-shaking over the machine age. We have always had machines, and men to express themselves through or over them. As he points out, there is a poetry of the mechanics of ship vs. water as old as language. He gives us the poetry of a new craft—but there is no poetry without the passion of men. And that is his true concern.

There has always been a gulf between the work of the world and the talk of it. The few workers who turn artists almost inevitably follow the esthetic form established by a long line of artists, who have never done more than play at work. We have fine objective "studies" of men at work. But when you think of all the passions long since torn to tatters, you might ask why there has been so little poetry of that shared passion of men together on the job—and it's never *what* job but doing it, and it's not only doing it well but, you might say, doing it under bond, with all the gradations and secret signs of its common language. Kipling had

an idea of it, but Kipling was Empire. Phew. Conrad knew it inside out, but Conrad was Romantic. Phew again. T. E. Lawrence had it but isn't he just too fascinating about Arabia and all. Movies continue to bring it out, but really, my dear chap, movies. Saint Exupéry cuts across all this; he speaks from the other side but in our own terms.

He knows, as some have found out and fewer admitted, that war is one of the things to bring men into this shared communion; but he knows better than most that no matter whose war it is they get their heads shot off. He knows better than any writer that the hardships of life in one of the vanguard services bind men together in a feeling that goes farther around the world and across the years than any emotion of the Deathless Odes. In his reluctance to speak of these things he frequently becomes lush and over-prosy; but there is no established language for such matters, and in some way he is still speaking of them. And he is breaking ground. He is making the grave poetry of an unknown and difficult craft, but underneath he is talking about the poetry of all the crafts men have worked at.

Now the poetic content of a craft, if it is to come off as literature, is roughly in proportion to its actual dangers and demands on human fortitude and wit; its appeal to the eye and imagination—*its necessity to the life of the world*. Men who go up flagpoles or across the Channel or into daring tailspins are bright figures, but dispensable. The hero who remains is the hero at his job, the man who said "We'll get there on time"; or the radio operator who calmly cleared all the last bits of traffic before slipping into the black waters alongside the "Vestris"; or Al the Greyhound bus driver, who will take his roaring fifteen tons at sixty miles an hour off the curving ice of the road back of Stafford Springs, some New England winter morning, calmly wagering his eye and brain and muscle and million perfect miles against the impossible schedule set by fools.

All men in their work have these emotional relations toward it, however obscurely. It is only the inborn writer among them who sifts out values and stores up their meanings without being conscious that he is doing it, or that he must some day find a word for it. Writers out for material or adventure or the pure lark always remain outsiders. And non-writers who have been convinced that their experiences would make a book naturally fall into the literary attitudes they imagine are expected of them, and go off into the useless rubbish of names, dates, funny coincidences.

This book brings out the thing men really live by, or rather among; for men live by and in their work only when their work becomes a passion that is understandable to and shared by their fellows. It tells what we must have known: that a man's allegiance is not to himself eventually. All men who have done work, however humble, have realized that above the work itself and the pyrotechnics of personal expression in it, there has been the work of the world, and without having the thing to say or the words to say it they

The Revolt Against Quietism

Knowledge for What? The Place of the Social Sciences in American Culture, by Robert S. Lynd. Princeton University Press. 278 pages. \$2.50.

ADD TO THE REBELS against quietism Robert S. Lynd: in fact, put him at the head of the revolt. Here is a portrait in acids of American social scientists keeping their placid tenor amid disaster—"seismologists watching a volcano," he calls them. Look at this canvas, he tells his colleagues, and see yourselves (the phrase is Auden's) "lecturing on navigation while the ship is going down." His colleagues won't like what he bids them see. They will refuse to face the fairly patent fact that the "detachment" and "objectivity" that they have exacted of themselves have been excuses for keeping quiet, dodges to avoid thinking, devices for saving their skins. Nevertheless every working social scientist in America should get this book and wrestle with it as with his own naked conscience. For while Lynd has written the most searching volume in the annals of self-criticism in American social science, he has also staked out the most spacious claims for the possibilities of social thinking—nothing short of the reconstruction of our culture. I like this sort of book. I find in it exactly the right mixture of the humble and the arrogant—humility about our achievements as thinkers, arrogance about the world we may yet win.

After the writing of "Middletown" Robert and Helen Lynd might have coasted in ease along the academic runway. But "Middletown in Transition"—a tighter, tenser, franker book—showed they had no intention of coasting. "Middletown" made Lynd a Columbia professor of Sociology. But instead of becoming safely oracular, he proceeds to ask in this book the simplest and yet the most disquieting questions. Why do our social scientists still lock themselves in airtight compartments? Why don't they fashion a culture concept which will follow the actual contours of American life and give cohesion to their work? Why don't they get down to the *cui bono* of their thinking and research—ask what their knowledge is for and what values it serves? Why don't they use the social sciences as tools, as ways of testing hypotheses which if acted upon might help build the sort of society in which alone free social thought can survive?

The questions are so direct that the "subtle" minds among social scientists have failed to see them and the "neutral" minds have scorned to ask them. We have had, of course, all sorts of coroner's inquiries into social science: we have had countless meetings of research experts, foundation moguls, tycoons of methodology, all of them adept at the art of raising and spending money so that two monographs will grow where one grew before. Lynd makes little pretension to originality and none to neutrality. What he has brought to his thesis is a capacity for sharp analysis, a rich and massive documentation, a forthrightness—and, above all, a heap of courage. He has put things into his book—things about the incidence of capitalism, the relation between thought and action, the need for planning, the meaning of the Soviet experience—that give me a pleasure with an added ironic twist because they are uttered by a Columbia professor in a course of Princeton lectures. And

books a craftsmanship that must win him an audience when he talks about method in social science. He has shown the falsity of Shaw's remark that "those who can, do; those who can't, teach." Lynd now adds precept to example.

There will, no doubt, be sharp protests from the academies. Julien Benda once wrote a book which he called "Le Trahison des Clercs," and there will be many to echo Benda's contention that any departure by the intellectuals from the medieval ideal of scholastic seclusion is treason. Crane Brinton, in *The Saturday Review*, says that social science like the physical sciences must grow by numberless small accretions of knowledge—and that, presumably, what happens to this knowledge is the concern not of the science of social study but of the art of social action. Lynd, he says in effect, has forgotten the condensation of accretions which is the real scientific tradition. Look at his index, he says: he does not mention the right people—Weber, Pareto, Henderson, Elton Mayo—with proper reverence; you will find in the index not the great names but a whole host of minusculi, fellows who write for *The New Republic* and *The Nation*.

I am glad Brinton has sharpened the issue. Lynd's whole point is that social science cannot recognize boundaries between the professional and amateur status, between the sacred and the secular in the tradition. It cannot survive as a closed union with jealously guarded jurisdictional divisions. Lynd himself has read widely and, what is more important, marginally. In his book the newer social sciences—anthropology, psychology, psychiatry—come into their own and thrust older ones like history, economics, politics, law into the background. And the new studies bring with them new and unhallowed names. For myself, I salute these names. And I salute also the newer spirit of an unashamed instrumentalism in social science. There can be no piling up of increments of social knowledge in the dark. Lancelot Hogben has shown, in his acute little book "The Retreat from Reason," that the cleavage between our intellectual habits and our patterns of living leads to the destruction of both. And the German experience has shown that while the scholars wait for increments of knowledge to pile up and find their own uses, there are other forces at work that are neither so patient nor so scrupulous. A social science in blinkers can only lead to social scientists in uniform.

There are passages of sheer writing brilliance in the book. In speaking of a return to *laissez-faire* or of "casual minor repairs in the machinery," he goes on, "If praying to the gods for rain does not increase the fertility of our fields, it avails little to redouble our prayers or to make alterations in their wording; we would better turn our energies to the techniques of agriculture." Or take this passage: "Alternatives to capitalism deserve careful analysis as well as ways of improving the operation of capitalism. One of the things that social science knows most surely today is that no culture can be realistically and effectively analyzed by those who elect to leave its central idols untouched; and, if fundamental change is required, it does no good simply to landscape the ground on which these idols stand." Yet the man who can write such sentences can also be guilty of long passages of an insistent hammering rhythm, or jargon like

I fear that while Lynd has liberated himself from the deadly indecisiveness of the American sociological tradition, he is still partly under the spell of its terminology. The reader will not find the book all easy going: but he will find it fertile with fresh leads into social inquiry.

It would have been even more fertile if the author had shifted his emphasis a bit from the theory of the culture pattern to the theory of social change and its class foundations. If we are to use the social sciences as tools, he says, we must have cohesiveness in our thinking. But when he tries to state where that cohesiveness may be found, he tends to do it on a one-dimensional plane of a theory of human nature and a theory of the culture pattern—the personality in the culture and the culture in the personality. I call this one-dimensional because I should have liked to see much more stress on the developmental sequences in a theory of social change. In a final magnificent chapter, "Some Outrageous Hypotheses," Lynd does deal with the problem of social change, and poses the question of how a sufficiently thoroughgoing change can be achieved. Yet it is significant that the social sciences that he stresses in the rest of the book are the pattern-sciences—psychology, anthropology, sociology. His treatment of recent developments in political science is inadequate, he is not at his best on economics, he neglects almost wholly the brilliant recent work in American legal theory and—most important of all—he considers history as ready for the discard.

From the standpoint of an inquiry into personality in culture and culture in personality, his emphasis is the right one. From the standpoint of an inquiry into the nature, sources, dynamics and consequences of social change, it needs extension. The pressing social inquiries today must be those turning on how power is captured and consolidated, why economies break down and how they can be gotten to work, how men think politically and how their thinking is manipulated, what new legal and administrative formations are emerging and how they can be used for human purposes, what revolutions are, why and how they occur, and how the revolutionary energies can be turned into humanist channels. In short, so far from discarding history, we need more and more to focus our attention on an adequate theory of history—which is to say, an adequate theory of social change.

I want to make clear that my quarrel with Lynd is not a basic one, but a matter of emphasis. The things I have mentioned are in the book: but I should have preferred to see the book built around them. With Lynd's major thesis and his general direction I agree wholly. And I agree also with the stress he lays on the enormous task that confronts social science. "There is no other agency in our culture," he says, "whose role it is to ask long-range and, if need be, abruptly irreverent questions of our democratic institutions; and to follow those questions with research and the systematic charting of the way ahead." Today research and planning of this sort are left to the foundations to organize, that is, to men whose thought-processes have already been shaped in the image of the power formations of the day. If our democracy were worth its salt, it would create a Research and Planning Commission to take over the functions of the foundations. And on it would be men like Robert

Stendhaliana

Stendhal, by F. C. Green. New York: The Macmillan Company. 344 pages. \$3.50.

HENRI BEYLE, whose commonest of many pseudonyms was Stendhal, wrote for "the happy few"—one or two people in his own generation, a few hundred, he hoped, scattered out through centuries to come. It is improbable that his work will ever be accessible to more than that rare élite who "contrary to all nature, are in the habit of thinking while they read." He died in 1842, yet as Léon Blum points out, no writer is more authentically of our own time, no novelist has changed more lives and none is more vigorously loved and hated in our day.

Let us begin by saying that Mr. Green's provocative and, at times, brilliant book is probably as satisfactory a biography of Stendhal as is to be found in any language. This does not mean, however, that it will meet with the unquestioned approval of all Stendhalians. Since the bulk of Stendhal's work amounts to one great spiritual autobiography, Mr. Green's task consisted largely in sifting, evaluating and bringing order into the cryptic jumble of autobiographical material found in Stendhal's novels, memoirs, notes and letters. He has untangled a maze of chronology and used excellent judgment in his interpretation of the facts of Stendhal's life. A knowledge of Stendhal's life is vital to an understanding of his work; though, as Mr. Green points out, "facts are not of immediate importance" to reality as Stendhal sees it. Therefore any biography of Stendhal must be in the nature of an interpretative essay.

Excellent as it is, Mr. Green's book is not perfect. To my mind it should have included an exhaustive critical bibliography, a thorough analysis of the influence and importance of this man who stands in the great line that runs from Montaigne down through Baudelaire, Barrès, Bergson, Gide and Proust, and a treatise on Stendhal's style, his war against the insidious hypocrisy of "literary language"—a subject as important to us in our day as it was to Stendhal in his. Also it seems that in his analysis of Julien Sorel, the hero of "Le Rouge et le Noir," Mr. Green ignores some of the very episodes that are most essential to the coherence of the plot and to any clear understanding of the motivations of Julien himself. Mr. Green does point out the stupidity of anti-Stendhalians who claim that the red and the black of the title symbolize the army and the church respectively, but why say that the main theme of the novel is "class hatred" instead of class consciousness and loyalty to an ideal to which bourgeois morality is repugnant? To describe as hatred Julien's ardent indignation and generous contempt for things that are contemptible seems little short of blasphemy. Understanding Stendhal as he does, Mr. Green might have rammed home the point that "Le Rouge et le Noir" is the "progress" of a proletarian pilgrim through the sloughs of hate and hypocrisy toward integrity and love. He does point out that "the ultimate factor which swayed Julien Sorel was the love of truth and justice," but on occasion we find him referring to Julien's "ruthlessness" without

Successful as it is, Mr. Green's book accentuates rather than obviates the necessity for other English biographies of Stendhal, seen through other temperaments and presenting many important aspects of the man that seem to have eluded the present biographer. But even more pressing than the need for biographies is the call for some competent Stendhalian to produce an English version of the documents which constitute both Stendhal's autobiography and a more effective presentation of his principles than any commentator is apt to achieve.

RAMON GUTHRIE

Stein on Picasso

Picasso, by Gertrude Stein. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 63 pages. \$3.

MISS GERTRUDE STEIN gives us Picasso in a polite and charming illustrated lecture, though the reproductions of his work seem somewhat indiscriminately chosen. Her chronological accounting of Picasso's development serves the author as skeletal support for her thesis. She stresses his Spanish birth, his arrival as a youth in Paris, and the subsequent "periods" of his versatile genius. Miss Stein observes: "Why have painters for friends when he could paint as he could paint . . . so in the beginning he knew intimately Max Jacob & at once afterwards Guillaume Apollinaire & André Salmon, & later he knew me & much later Jean Cocteau & still later the Surrealists, this is his literary history." Picasso, it appears, "has not the distraction of learning." He is wholly a painter and draughtsman.

This literary portrait of Picasso is drawn in a cubist manner, certain elements are noted, others ignored; the seen elements are isolated, broken down, reassembled; and as the figure represented gradually emerges, one is not surprised to recognize a strong resemblance to Gertrude Stein (perhaps it is a mandolin in her lap, perhaps it is Picasso).

Miss Stein makes it clear that her own problem in writing and Picasso's problem in painting are identical. She defines the pure artist as a contemporary who "understands what is contemporary when the contemporaries do not yet know it." It is the artist, sensitive and irresponsible, who grasps significant changes before the rest of us can recognize them. He should not, however, be aware of the significance of these changes, for he cannot allow his vision to be distorted. The artist may not comment, he can only expose. Miss Stein seems to feel, moreover, that complete isolation and total lack of learning are necessary features of this hygienic regime so that the artist may approach more nearly a state of saintly but receptive idiocy.

Picasso's artistic mutations are explained in terms of the influences which different countries had upon him: the "sadness and monotony" of Spain (blue period), the "gentle poetry of France" (pink or harlequin period), the Spanish landscape again (cubism), and so on. These changes are ascribed to Picasso's recurring need of "emptying himself"—of his visions, one gathers—in order that he may be able to see the next vision truthfully. Miss Stein believes that while Picasso knows and is absorbed by the heads and bodies of human beings, the soul of people does not interest him. At one time Picasso began to concern himself with souls—to interpret them.

not seen but conceived." No longer able to empty himself, he stopped working.

Miss Stein's observations are witty and often illuminating; more illuminating perhaps in regard to her own work than to the work of her star performer. One suspects that Picasso himself may well be irritated at the esoteric role she has assigned to him.

As a critical explanation of the artist's place in society, her definition is trivial and limited. It is true that an intensely personal need often impels the artist; yet it is difficult to understand why as an articulate "contemporary" he should be restricted to a statement of his primary sensory reactions. It is also true that he is sometimes forced to choose between isolation and extinction. The ivory tower has its uses but they must be differentiated from the functions of a padded cell.

NATHALIE SWAN

Prelude to the Present

The Thirty Years War, by C. V. Wedgwood. New Haven: Yale University Press. 544 pages. \$4.50.

ATROCIOUS as it seemed to its contemporaries, the Thirty Years War seems milder when judged by our own advanced standards; indeed, it becomes a sort of pastoral prelude to the grim music of tomorrow. Most of our present-day themes are there, grossly sketched: treacherous Munichs, appeasing Chamberlains, swaggering generals, and statesmen who cleverly worked out their own destruction. It all began quite "ideologically," as a struggle between Protestants and Catholics; it was carried on with a business-like ruthlessness, gold from America playing an important part, and the only sufferers being the common people; and it ended very "realistically," when Catholic France crushed Catholic Spain, thereby ensuring good profits to Protestant Holland.

Public opinion, although deprived of our powerful means of misinformation—daily press, cables, radio—was on the whole almost as confused as today, and it took some time before people realized that they were in the midst of a great historic convulsion. The propaganda technique, hampered by incomprehensible moral scruples, was not so adequate: after the Catholic Hapsburg troops had burned Magdeburg, killing thousands of civilians, they were decent enough at Vienna to hush the thanksgivings; nobody had the simple idea of accusing the Reds, as after the destruction of Guernica by German and Italian planes.

The similarities between that period and our own are no more accidental than the reappearance of childish symptoms in old age. In the Thirty Years War, the economic forces that molded modern Europe were engaged in their first large-scale struggle; everywhere in it we find the characteristic style of capitalism: sordid interests operating under the mask of high ideals. Miss Wedgwood sees the development in terms of power politics, without sufficiently stressing their background. But within these traditional limits, she has written an exceptionally interesting study. She has not only succeeded in skillfully arranging complex material; she has also enriched her narrative by all the elements that make history exciting from a "human" point of view: her

New Books: A Reader's List

JAPAN OVER ASIA, by William Henry Chamberlin (Little, Brown, \$3.50). A new edition, revised and brought up to date. On the basis of his recent observations, Mr. Chamberlin believes that the Chinese war will end either in a compromise peace that would be a victory for Japan or else in an undeclared peace of exhaustion. Japan won't have a breakdown, he thinks, unless she takes on more enemies.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND: From the Convention of the Long Parliament to the Restoration (1640-1660), by W. K. Jordan (Harvard, \$5). The third and next-to-last volume in Dr. Jordan's series discusses the fight for supremacy among the religious sects of the Civil War and interregnum. A scholarly and readable book, based on a new examination of source material.

HOW SOCIALISM WORKS, by John Strachey (Modern Age, 50 cents). A revised and abridged version of Strachey's "Theory and Practice of Socialism." The author's purpose in both books is to show the basic distinctions between capitalist and socialist systems of production and distribution, with special reference to the Soviet Union.

TUMBLING IN THE HAY, by Oliver St. John Gogarty (Reynal and Hitchcock, \$2.50). Gogarty's career as a medical student in Dublin forty years ago—a career better adjusted to cutting capers than corpses. Low company and high spirits in an exuberant, comical, boisterous and often perplexing extravaganza.

NIGHT OVER ENGLAND, by Eugene and Arline Löhrke (Harrison-Hilton, \$2). An alert young American couple, after three years on a farm in Sussex, England, give their impressions of the English upper-class mentality. A beautifully written analysis and a revealing commentary on the prevailing international crisis.

MAINE SUMMER, by Edwin Valentine Mitchell (Coward-McCann, \$2.50). A Connecticut Yankee, historian of the horse-and-buggy days, writes in a leisurely and discursive

manner of islands, shipbuilding, antiques, old taverns and other matters of interest to the summer visitor in the hook-and-rugged state of Maine.

NEBRASKA COAST, by Clyde Brion Davis (Farrar and Rinehart, \$2.50). Some genuine Americana; chalk up Mr. Davis' outspoken hero as the best representative of the frontier of the sixties that one is likely to meet in fiction. The story is seen through the eyes of a young boy, but the rambling, quietly humorous, unemphatic style is that of an old man, telling his memoirs and taking his time about it.

Contributors

NATHANIEL PEPPER is the author of "Must We Fight in Asia?" and "China: The Collapse of a Civilization," as well as other books on the Far East. He is a member of the faculty of Columbia University.

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH has been a correspondent in Spain for both The New York Times and The London Times.

W. JETT LAUCK is acting chairman of the national policy board of the American Association for Economic Freedom.

WILLIAM CARLOS WILLIAMS is the author of several books of verse, a novel and books of short stories, the most recent of which is "Life Along the Passaic River."

JOY DAVIDMAN is the author of "Letter to a Comrade," published last winter in the Yale Series of Younger Poets.

MAX LERNER is professor of Political Science at Williams College, and author of "It Is Later Than You Think." A new book, "Ideas Are Weapons," is scheduled for fall publication.

RAMON GUTHRIE has written three books of poetry and two novels. He is a professor of Romance Languages at Dartmouth College.

NATHALIE SWAN is an architectural designer living in New York City.

NORBERT GUTERMAN, who has a doctorate from the Sorbonne, writes for magazines here and in Paris.

RESORTS

SCAROON MANOR HOTEL
on SCHROON LAKE, N.Y.
In the Heart of the Adirondacks
9 HOLE GOLF COURSE
ON PREMISES
9 CLAY TENNIS COURTS
8 HANDBALL COURTS

SUMMER RENTALS

SHARON, CONN., Furnished Bungalow; combined living-sleeping room; extra bedroom; kitchenette; lavatory shower; electricity; garage. Magnificent view Berkshires. \$150 for season. Address: Box 151, The New Republic.

BEAUTIFUL, LARGE furnished rooms. Sea shore.

APARTMENT FOR RENT

OUTSIDE LARGE living-room bedroom combination, private dressing room, furnished in excellent taste. Suitable couple. Cultured atmosphere. Telephone ATwater 9-4639; 1240 Park Ave. (96th St.).

SCHOLARSHIP

SMALL, co-educational experimental college is offering to outstanding students a few

TRAVEL

Second Educational Seminar to Scandinavia, via England, July 6 to Aug. 22, with or without university credit. Direction of Professor Lawrence Pasel, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York.

Inquire at once

LITERARY HELP

THESIS WORK, RESEARCH PAPERS. Special Articles. Addresses, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable results. Over twenty years consistent service to patrons. **AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU**, 616 Fifth Avenue, New York.

POSITIONS WANTED

WOMAN, 26; single, college and university graduate; nine years teaching experience, seeks position as governess. Address: Box 160, The New Republic.

FORMER MEMBER OF STAFF of University and State Labor Department, 5 years' experience. Personnel work, Guidance, Psychology, Education, seeks part-time or full-time position. Address, Box 159, The New Republic.

RESEARCH assistance and editorial revision offered by Yale A.B.; Columbia A.M., Ph.D. Graduate Fellowship in Social Sciences. Will travel anywhere. J. D. Silvert, Standish Hall, 45 West 81st Street, New York, N. Y.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB